IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Civil Action No. 2:23-cv-00691

In re: U LOCK INC., Debtor

George Snyder, Appellant,

v. CHRISTINE BIROS, Appellee

BRIEF OF CHRISTINE BIROS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Hon. Gregory L. Taddonio, Chief United States Bankruptcy Judge, from the Order Sustaining Christine Biros' Objection to George Snyder's Claim Entered April 14, 2023, at Case22-20823-GLT

Counsel of Record for this Party:

Robert S. Bernstein, Esq. Pa. I.D. No. 34308 Sarah E. Wenrich, Esq. Pa. I.D. No. 325834

BERNSTEIN-BURKLEY, P.C. 601 Grant Street 9th Floor Pittsburgh, PA 15219 (412) 456-8100 Telephone (412) 456-8135 Facsimile rbernstein@bernsteinlaw.com swenrich@bernsteinlaw.com

INDEX

| EXHIBIT A | 1 |
|------------------|-----|
| Ехнівіт В | 189 |
| Ехнівіт С | 191 |
| Ехнівіт D | 195 |
| Ехнівіт Е | 196 |
| EXHIBIT F | 211 |

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

| IN RE: | Bankruptcy No. 22-20823 |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| U LOCK INC, | Chapter 7 |
| Debtor. | D. L. ID. M |
| CHRISTINE BIROS, | Related Doc. No.: |
| Movant, | |
| v. | |
| GEORGE SNYDER, | |
| Respondent. | |

OBJECTION TO CLAIM NUMBER 5 FILED BY GEORGE SNYDER

Christine Biros, as creditor and party in interest in the above captioned chapter 7 bankruptcy case ("Biros"), by and through the undersigned counsel, files this *Objection to Claim Number 5 Filed by George Snyder* (the "Objection"), and in support thereof states as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. The Court has jurisdiction over this Objection pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1334. This matter is a core proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2). Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.
- 2. The statutory predicates for the relief requested herein are section 502 of the Bankruptcy Code and Rules 3002 and 3007 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure ("FRBP").
- 3. Biros is a creditor and party-in-interest in this case and thus has standing to object to the claim pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 502.

BACKGROUND

- 4. U Lock Inc. ("Debtor" or "U Lock")'s case was commenced by the filing of an involuntary petition for relief under Chapter 7 of Title 11 of the United States Code on April 27, 2022 (the "Petition Date").
 - 5. The Debtor did not file a response to the involuntary petition.
 - 6. On June 17, 2022, the Court entered an Order for Relief.
- 7. George Snyder ("Snyder") and his brother Kash Snyder ("Kash") are the principals of the Debtor.
- 8. Robert H. Slone (the "<u>Trustee</u>") is the duly appointed Chapter 7 Trustee for the Debtor and is so acting.
- 9. On August 26, 2022, Snyder filed a proof of claim, claim number 5 on the claims docket, in the amount of \$99,000.00 for "wage, fair labor standards" with no supporting documentation or other description (the "Wage Claim" or "Claim Number 5").

CLAIM OBJECTION

- 10. 11 U.S.C. § 502 provides that a properly filed proof of claim is deemed allowed unless a party in interest objects. Various subsections of section 502 set forth the grounds for disallowing a claim, including section 502(b)(1), which authorizes disallowance because the claim is unenforceable under any agreement or applicable law.
- 11. Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(1), in relevant part, if an objection to a claim is made, the court shall determine the amount of such claim as of the date of the filing of the petition, and shall allow such claim in such amount, except to the extent that such claim is unenforceable against the debtor and property of the debtor, under any agreement or applicable law for a reason other than because such claim is contingent or unmatured.

- 12. The burden of proof for claims filed pursuant to 11 U.S.C.S. § 502(a) is a shifting one and rests on different parties at different times. Under applicable law, the claimant must initially allege sufficient facts to support its claim and, upon meeting this standard of sufficiency, the claim is prima facie valid. Upon objection to the claim, the burden then shifts to the objecting party to produce evidence sufficient to negate the prima facie valid claim. If the objector produces sufficient evidence to negate one or more of the sworn facts in the proof of claim, the burden then reverts back to the claimant. The claimant must then prove the validity of the claim by a preponderance of the evidence. *Benninger v. First Colony Life Ins. Co. (In re Benninger)*, 357 B.R. 337, 340 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2006).
- 13. Snyder's Wage Claim is based on alleged wages due from the Debtor assumingly pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, 28 U.S.C. §§201 to 209 (the "Fair Labor Act"). The Claim should be disallowed as not enforceable under applicable law against the Debtor for the reasons set forth herein.
- 14. Snyder signed Official Form 202 Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury for Non-Individual Debtors indicating that as Director of the Debtor he has examined the information in the schedules and statement of financial affairs filed and believes it to be true and correct (the "Schedules"). *See*, Declaration, Doc. No. 66.
- 15. Schedule D and E/F do not list Snyder as a creditor or having any claim, cause of action or otherwise against the Debtor.
- 16. Additionally, Schedule G does not list any employment or other executory contract with Snyder.
- 17. Nowhere in the Schedules is there any evidence of a debt owed to Snyder. If Snyder had any such claim for wages from Debtor at the time he signed the Schedules under penalty of

perjury, he should and would have made it known. The fact that he did not disclose it confirms

that he did not believe that he had any right to payment from the Debtor.

18. Moreover, Snyder is judicially estopped from making any such claim now by

failure to disclose it in the Schedules and during the course of this case, including at the two 341

meeting of creditors.

19. Judicial estoppel is a discretionary doctrine recognized by the Third Circuit that

prevents injury to the courts and the justice system by dismissing claims — regardless of their

merit — when such dismissal is necessary to prevent a litigant from playing fast and loose with

the courts. The doctrine is applied only to avoid a miscarriage of justice and only when the party

to be estopped (1) took a position during litigation that is irreconcilably inconsistent with his or

her present position, (2) the party changed his or her position in bad faith, and (3) no lesser sanction

would adequately remedy the damage done by the litigant's misconduct. The Third Circuit and

district courts have invoked the doctrine to dismiss claims where plaintiffs who are in bankruptcy

(or were in bankruptcy) failed to disclose to creditors pending or potential causes of action as

contingent assets in bankruptcy filings. Judicial estoppel remains a fact-specific, equitable

doctrine, applied at the courts' discretion. Coles v. Carlini, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 101873, *1

20. Snyder, as principal of the Debtor, has testified extensively that the Debtor has no

employees.

21. In fact, both Snyder and Kash, the principals of the Debtor testified that the Debtor

had no employees when the bankruptcy was filed and never had any. See, September 9, 2022 341

Transcript ("September 341 Transcript"), Page 15:3-13); Page 16:1-2; Page 29:5. A true and

correct copy of the September 341 Transcript is attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit

"A'.

22. See also, 341 Transcript January 6, 2023 ("January 341 Transcript"), Page 8-9. A

True and correct copy of the January 341 Transcript is attached hereto and included herein as

Exhibit "B".

23. Additionally, on October 1, 2018, U Lock responded to Biros' initial discovery

requests in an action filed in Westmoreland County against U Lock (the "Discovery Responses")

when asked to identify all current and former employees of Debtor, that "it does not maintain

employees and did not maintain employees in the past. U Lock operates through officers,

volunteers, and contractors." A true and correct copy of the relevant redacted portion of the

Discovery Responses are attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit "B".

24. Additionally, Snyder testified at the September 341 when asked about why his

Wage Claim wasn't listed on the Debtor's Schedules as follows: "The \$99,000 was what Christine

would owe me. We were -- Christine was in charge. She was the -- she was the silent partner, and

things changed along the way and now this lawsuit came and as, as a result, any work I've done

there over the past seven years I didn't get paid. So I never got any officer compensation or

anything from her, so that those -- those stem from my wages, not -- not others." Exhibit A, Page

22:24-23:11.

25. This testimony reflects that Snyder did not believe the Debtor owed him any money

for employment but rather believed he was owed money (or property) from Biros relating to their

ongoing dispute over the real property from which the Debtor operated. Biros was not an officer

or director of the Debtor and had no control over compensation or wages- officer or employee.

26. Snyder later testified during continued questioning on his Wage Claim at the

September 341 that "well either her or U Lock owes me, you know, at least minimum wage, but

she controlled the company." Exhibit A, Page 24:9-11.

BIROS_APPENDIX_0005

27. Snyder's testimony to defend his Wage Claim is that he, Kash Snyder and Shanni Snyder all worked for the Debtor but did not receive any pay. Yet, Kash Snyder has not filed a claim nor was any claim listed for Kash Snyder on the Schedules. In fact, there are no employee claims listed on the Schedules (excluding Shanni Snyder's claim based on her fraudulent Default Judgment arising from alleged unpaid wages).

28. Likewise, Snyder signed the attached Declaration to the Trustee under penalty of perjury (the "Declaration") regarding employees and the nonissuance of any W2s or 1099s that there were no salaried employees and no 1099s were filed because any persons who did work did not receive cash compensation in excess of \$550.00. A true and correct copy of the Declaration is attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit "C".

- 29. In the Declaration, Snyder testifies as follows: "Our executive employees such as John Biros, Kash Snyder and myself, we did not take money for salary, all hoping to advance the company until Robert Biros interfered and made Christine Biros file suit. I understand we were due minimum wage for our work because even executives are entitled to that, but we did not pay it because the company had very little revenue." *See*, Exhibit C, ¶7.
- 30. However, Snyder is not entitled to minimum wage under the Fair Labor Act, even if Snyder could make a claim to be an employee as it is inapplicable here.
- 31. First, as set forth above, Snyder is not an employee of the Debtor as the Debtor had no employees and thus the Fair Labor Act would not apply.
- 32. Second, even assuming arguendo, Snyder was somehow able to establish he was an "employee," the Fair Labor Act provides in relevant part in Section 203(2) that any establishment that has as its **only regular employees the owner thereof** or the parent, spouse, child or other members of the immediate family of such owner **shall not be considered to be an**

enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce as part of such

enterprise.

33. To receive minimum wage under the Fair Labor Act, Section 206 requires

minimum wage for every employer to pay to his employees who in any workweek is engaged in

commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. 29 U.S.C. Section 206.

34. Accordingly, pursuant to the Fair Labor Act, Snyder would not be eligible to

receive minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act as he is the owner of the Debtor and

thus the Debtor would not be considered to be an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the

production of goods for commerce as part of such enterprise.

35. Snyder might try to claim that he was a contractor or contract worker for U Lock

during the multiple years covered by his Wage Claim.

36. There is no assertion or evidence in any of the numerous pleadings and other filings

under oath by Snyder or U Lock that would support any claim that there was a contract relationship

between Snyder and U Lock for the providing of the services that Snyder claims to have provided.

37. There is no contract under applicable non-bankruptcy law. There is no bankruptcy

law basis for a prepetition claim by Snyder as asserted in Claim Number 5.

38. Even if Snyder could maintain a claim against U Lock under the Fair Labor Act,

the Claim is deficient on its face as there is no applicable time period or calculation provided to

provide support for the Wage Claim. Accordingly, it is likely that the Wage Claim could not cover

the time period requested, as the statute of limitations under the Fair Labor Act is two years and

arguably this Wage Claim seeks more than seven (7) years of alleged wages in Claim Number 5.

28 U.S.C.S. §255(a).

39. "Under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), the applicable statute of limitations

BIROS_APPENDIX_0007 EXHIBIT A is three years for a willful violation, two years otherwise. 29 U.S.C.S. 255(a). *Copley v. Evolution Well Servs. Operating, LLC,* No. 2:20-CV-1442-CCW, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17266, at *1 (W.D. Pa. Jan. 31, 2022)

- 40. When an employer's actions are willful, the statute of limitations is extended to three years: "a cause of action arising out of a willful violation may be commenced within three years after the cause of action accrued. " 29 U.S.C. § 255(a). Kelly v. Eckerd Corp., No. 03-4087, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4381, at *4-5 (E.D. Pa. Mar. 10, 2004)
- 41. Even if Snyder were to allege the doctrine of equitable tolling, for the doctrine of equitable tolling to apply to the Fair Labor Act, a defendant's misleading conduct must induce a plaintiff to delay filing notice of her intent to sue. The doctrine is not applied, however, every time a defendant makes an incorrect or even misleading statement to the Plaintiff. Likewise, the Plaintiff has the burden of proving facts necessary to invoke the equitable tolling doctrine. *See, Kelly v. Eckerd Corp.* 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4381, at *4-5.
- 42. Additionally, as referenced in the Declaration, the Debtor had no money to pay any officer or owner claims. Snyder is a shareholder, director and officer of the Debtor and under Pennsylvania law, corporate directors owe fiduciary duties to the corporation and its shareholders. When the corporation is insolvent, the directors also owe fiduciary duties to the corporation's creditors. *Bruno v. Beacon Sales Acquisition, Inc. (In re Bruno)*, 553 B.R. 280, 286 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2016).
- 43. Snyder's Wage Claim then would be a breach of his fiduciary duties to the Debtor as he incurred his personal employment claim during a time that the Debtor was insolvent. Snyder, as a director and officer of the Debtor, would have known that the Debtor was insolvent yet allowed

the Debtor to continue to operate and incur his alleged wages, as well as a default judgment against the company (of which he was aware and did not defend) by his sister, Shanni Snyder.

- 44. Moreover, Claim Number 5 should be disallowed by this Honorable Court pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105.
- 45. The United States Supreme Court has recognized that by filing a claim against the bankruptcy estate, a creditor triggers the process of "allowance and disallowance of claims," thereby subjecting the creditor to the bankruptcy court's equitable power. *See*, *Langenkamp v*. *Culp*, 498 US 41, 44-45 (1990).
- 46. The bankruptcy court has the power to look behind and reduce claims based on judgments issued by other courts, both state and federal. *In Margolis v. Nazareth Fair Grounds*, 249 F.2d 221 (2nd Cir. 1957), the Second Circuit held that a bankruptcy court may inquire into the validity of any claim asserted against the bankrupt and may disallow it if it is found to be without lawful existence and the mere fact that a claim has been reduced to a judgment does not prevent such an inquiry. As the merger of a claim into a judgment does not change its nature so far as provability is concerned so the court may look behind the judgment to determine the essential nature of the liability for purposes of proof and allowance. *Margolis v. Nazareth Fair Grounds*, 294 F.2d at *223-224 (internal citations omitted).
- 47. A claim should be rejected and disallowed when it has no basis in fact or law, is non-existent or illegal." *Diasonics, Inc. v. Ingalls*, 121 B.R. 626, 630 (Bankr. N.D. Fla. 1990) (citation omitted).
- 48. In *Benninger v. First Colony Life Ins. Co. (In re Benninger)*, 357 B.R. 337, 350-51 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2006), Judge Deller applied Supreme Court precedent to disallow claims in that case as the judgments confessed against the Debtor were unlawful, referencing *Pepper v.*

Litton, 308 U.S. 295, 301-303, 60 S. Ct. 238, 84 L. Ed. 281 (1939), where the United States Supreme Court allowed a debtor to challenge a state court judgment in bankruptcy court on the ground that a confessed judgment obtained by fraud was void *ab initio* for procedural reasons.

- 49. In *Benninger*, the objection to proofs of claim filed by the creditor were sustained and the claims disallowed for grounds including but not limited to the unclean hands of the creditor. Judge Deller acknowledged, "It is one of the fundamental principles upon which equity jurisprudence is founded, that before a complainant can have standing in court he must first show that not only has he a good and meritorious cause of action, but he must come into court with clean hands." *Benninger* at 350.
- 50. Additionally, the Court held that it also found "equally troubling" the fact that the underlying basis of the creditor's claims were "dubious at best." Thus, Judge Deller ruled that even if the claims had some basis, he would nonetheless disallow them under the clean hands doctrine and for public policy reasons. *Benninger* at 360.
- 51. It is clear from the face of Claim Number 5, the complete lack of support for the Wage Claim, including even a simple calculation of wages incurred, and the sworn testimony of the officers of the Debtor that they had no employees, the failure to schedule the Wage Claim or otherwise disclose it, despite being the Officer who prepared and signed the Schedules under penalty of perjury, the Wage Claim should also be denied for public policy reasons.
- 52. Finally, 11 U.S.C. §502(d) provides in relevant part that a court shall disallow any claim of any entity that is a transferee of a transfer avoidable under 11 U.S.C. §§547 or 548 unless such entity or transferee has paid the amount or turned over any such property.
- 53. At the September and January 341 hearings, Snyder testified that he received the proceeds from the sale of a 2021 Kubota. See Exhibit A Page 12:18-13:3; Exhibit B, Page 37:1-

Case 22-20823-23BTcv-0069337B Filed 02/24/23 Elete 106/302/23/23-23-23-25 262 esc Main Document Page 11 of 11

13; Page 67:18.69:17. Snyder testified that the Kubota was sold in November 2021 and he paid

himself back for an outstanding loan from the sale.

54. Biros believes and therefore avers, the Trustee will be filing a Complaint to Avoid

and Recover the proceeds Snyder received from the Kubota pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 547 and

accordingly, the claim should also be disallowed pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 502(d).

WHEREFORE, Christine Biros respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter an

order substantially in the form attached hereto granting this Objection and disallowing the Snyder

Claim.

Dated: February 24, 2023

BERNSTEIN-BURKLEY, P.C.

By: /s/ Robert S. Bernstein

Robert S. Bernstein (PA ID No. 34308)

Lara S. Martin (PA ID No. 307272)

601 Grant Street, Floor 9

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Telephone: (412) 456-8100

Facsimile: (412) 456-8135

rbernstein@bernsteinlaw.com

<u>lmartin@bernsteinlaw.com</u>

Counsel for Christine Biros

Transcript of the Testimony of

341 (a) MEETING OF CREDITORS

September 9, 2022

IN RE: U LOCK, INC.



412-261-2323 depo@akf.com www.akf.com

BIROS APPENDIX 0012

Case 22-2082326-LV-00001-338-1DoEilect-02/22/23lect-0868ed202/24/28 09:622464 Desc Exhibit A Page 2 of 124 341 (a) MEETING OF CREDITORS - 9/9/2022

| | 1 |
|--|---|
| IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA | |
| Bankruptcy No. 22-20823-GLT | |
| Chapter 7 | |
| - | |
| | |
| <pre>In re:))</pre> | |
| U LOCK INC., | |
| Debtor.) | / |
| | |
| | |
| TRANSCRIPT OF RECORDED PROCEEDINGS: | |
| 341(a) MEETING OF CREDITORS | |
| September 9, 2022 | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

INDEX WITNESS: GEORGE SNYDER EXAMINATION BY MR. SLONE - PAGE 5 EXAMINATION BY MS. WENRICH - PAGE 22 EXAMINATION BY MR. OTTO - PAGE 29 EXAMINATION BY MS. SHANNI SNYDER - PAGE 95 EXHIBITS INTRODUCED: (NONE)

341 (a) MEETING OF CREDITORS - 9/9/2022

| | 4 |
|----|---|
| 1 | MR. SLONE: Call the Section |
| 2 | 341(a) Meeting in the case of U Lock Inc., |
| 3 | Case 22-20823-GLT. This is the time and |
| 4 | place for the meeting. I'm Robert Slone, |
| 5 | the interim Trustee. Allen Roth is present |
| 6 | as attorney for U Lock. |
| 7 | Mr. Roth, who's present to testify for |
| 8 | U Lock today? |
| 9 | MR. ROTH: I have George, excuse |
| 10 | me, George Snyder here. |
| 11 | MR. SLONE: Okay. And what |
| 12 | officer is Mr. Snyder? |
| 13 | MR. ROTH: Vice president. |
| 14 | MR. SLONE: Vice president? |
| 15 | Okay. |
| 16 | MR. ROTH: Yes. |
| 17 | MR. SLONE: Okay. Before, let me |
| 18 | swear him in. Mr. Snyder, please raise your |
| 19 | right hand. And do you swear that the |
| 20 | testimony you're about to give in this |
| 21 | matter to be the truth? |
| 22 | MR. GEORGE SNYDER: Yes, I do. |
| 23 | MR. SLONE: Okay. Now, we have |
| 24 | some creditors present. I'm going to ask |
| 25 | you to state your name for the record. |

341 (a) MEETING OF CREDITORS - 9/9/2022

| | | 5 |
|----|---|---|
| 1 | Start with Sarah Wenrich. | |
| 2 | MS. WENRICH: Hi, Mr. Slone. | |
| 3 | Sarah Wenrich here on behalf of Christine | |
| 4 | Biros, and William Otto is here as well on | |
| 5 | behalf of Ms. Biros. | |
| 6 | MR. SLONE: Okay. | |
| 7 | MS. WENRICH: My apologies, Ms. | |
| 8 | Biros is also on the line. | |
| 9 | MR. SLONE: Okay, great. And | |
| 10 | Shanni Snyder, are you still present? | |
| 11 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: Yes, I am. | |
| 12 | MR. SLONE: Okay, and you're here | |
| 13 | for yourself; right? | |
| 14 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: Yes. | |
| 15 | MR. SLONE: Okay. | |
| 16 | EXAMINATION OF GEORGE SNYDER: | |
| 17 | BY MR. SLONE | |
| 18 | Q. Okay, Mr Mr. Snyder, you're | |
| 19 | testifying as vice president of U Lock. Did | |
| 20 | you sign well, I'll get to that. Did you | |
| 21 | receive a copy of the informational sheet | |
| 22 | prepared by the Office of the U.S. Trustee? | |
| 23 | A. Yes. | |
| 24 | Q. And did you read that sheet? | |
| 25 | A. Yes. | |

Q. Oh, okay, I'm sorry.

25

341 (a) MEETING OF CREDITORS - 9/9/2022

| | | 7 |
|-----|--|---|
| 1 | A business. | |
| 2 | Q. Does the company expect to receive | |
| 3 | anything of value in the next six months? | |
| 4 | A. Let me let me back up for a | |
| 5 | minute. I had mentioned to you, we talked | |
| 6 | about that Kubota tractor I brought in the | |
| 7 | I brought in the serial number for you. | |
| 8 | That was sold last year. | |
| 9 | Q. Okay. | |
| L 0 | A. And then the Christine Biros | |
| 1 | property. | |
| _2 | Q. Does the company expect to receive | |
| 13 | anything of value in the next six months? | |
| 4 | A. Just whatever other rents would be | |
| _5 | collected. | |
| L 6 | Q. Do you have a claim or cause of | |
| _7 | action against anyone for any reason or does | |
| 8 ـ | anyone owe you money? | |
| _9 | A. Yeah, everything what's in the | |
| 20 | schedule there. | |
| 21 | Q. Okay. It says see | |
| 22 | A. And it | |
| 23 | Q. See schedules. Does the company own | |
| 24 | any real estate or real estate that has not | |
| 25 | been listed? | |
| | | |

341 (a) MEETING OF CREDITORS - 9/9/2022

| | | 8 |
|----|--|---|
| 1 | A. Yes. | |
| 2 | Q. You're saying yes. Is that the | |
| 3 | property, the 21 acres? | |
| 4 | A. Yes. | |
| 5 | Q. And that's subject to the Biros | |
| 6 | claim; right? | |
| 7 | A. Correct. | |
| 8 | Q. What was this was an involuntary; | |
| 9 | right? | |
| 10 | A. Correct. | |
| 11 | Q. But you didn't contest it? | |
| 12 | A. That's correct. | |
| 13 | Q. So what's the reason for filing this | |
| 14 | case? | |
| 15 | A. The reason that the other person | |
| 16 | filed the filed the lawsuit, you mean, or | |
| 17 | filed the involuntary bankruptcy? | |
| 18 | Q. Yeah, but why didn't you contest it? | |
| 19 | A. (Inaudible). | |
| 20 | Q. I mean, there's a reason that you're | |
| 21 | in bankruptcy, or you would have contested | |
| 22 | it? | |
| 23 | A. Well, I was served I was served | |
| 24 | an involuntary bankruptcy and I kind of | |
| 25 | actually thought (Inaudible). | |
| | | |

| | | 9 |
|----|---|---|
| 1 | MR. SLONE: Whoever that is, | |
| 2 | please mute yourself. | |
| 3 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: (Inaudible) | |
| 4 | playing. | |
| 5 | A. We really had, you know, no assets | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | Q. Hang on, Mr. Snyder. | |
| 8 | A. We have okay. | |
| 9 | MR. SLONE: Somebody's phone is | |
| 10 | ringing or something. Check your phones, | |
| 11 | everybody. Thank you. | |
| 12 | Q. Okay, Mr. Snyder you can continue. | |
| 13 | A. Okay, I said we didn't really have | |
| 14 | any assets. We owed money, and we didn't | |
| 15 | really have any defenses for the claims. So | |
| 16 | the bankruptcy may have other defenses. | |
| 17 | Q. When was U Lock incorporated? | |
| 18 | Approximately when was it incorporated? | |
| 19 | Hello? Anybody there? | |
| 20 | MS. WENRICH: I'm here. I'm | |
| 21 | still here. | |
| 22 | MR. OTTO: I'm here. | |
| 23 | Q. Okay. | |
| 24 | MR. OTTO: I'm here. | |
| 25 | Q. When was the company incorporated? | |

| | | 10 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | Mr. Roth, do you know? | |
| 2 | George Snyder and Allen Roth, are you guys | |
| 3 | on the line? Hello? | |
| 4 | MR. SLONE: Okay, everybody else | |
| 5 | is on the line; right? Mr | |
| 6 | MS. WENRICH: Yes. | |
| 7 | MR. SLONE: Sarah and Bill? | |
| 8 | MR. OTTO: Yes. | |
| 9 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: This is | |
| 10 | Shanni. I'm still on the line. | |
| 11 | MR. OTTO: This is Bill Otto. | |
| 12 | I'm still on the line. | |
| 13 | MR. SLONE: Okay. What happened | |
| 14 | to Snyder and Roth? | |
| 15 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: Seems like it | |
| 16 | was disconnected. | |
| 17 | MR. SLONE: Were they at the same | |
| 18 | place? Oh, Jesus. | |
| 19 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: Oh, me? I | |
| 20 | have no idea. | |
| 21 | MR. SLONE: Okay. I don't know | |
| 22 | what to say. | |
| 23 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: I think that | |
| 24 | was just, the music that was playing was | |
| 25 | from the office. | |

| | | 11 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | MR. SLONE: Could somebody call | |
| 2 | Roth? Maybe I can call him on my cell | |
| 3 | phone. Okay, we'll call. (Phone dialing.) | |
| 4 | MR. SLONE: Hi, Bob Slone | |
| 5 | calling. We are in a meeting of creditors | |
| 6 | for U Lock and Allen Roth and George Snyder | |
| 7 | disappeared. Are they there? | |
| 8 | MR. ROTH: Hi, this is Allen. | |
| 9 | MR. SLONE: Allen, you guys | |
| 10 | disappeared from the | |
| 11 | MR. ROTH: Yeah, I was trying to | |
| 12 | call back in 'cause I have no idea what | |
| 13 | happened. (Inaudible) went blank. | |
| 14 | MR. SLONE: Okay, call back in. | |
| 15 | If not, we'll put you on the on, on the | |
| 16 | cell phone. But call back in right now. | |
| 17 | MR. ROTH: Okay. | |
| 18 | MR. SLONE: Thank you. | |
| 19 | MR. ROTH: We'll do it right now. | |
| 20 | MR. SLONE: Okay, they're calling | |
| 21 | back in. | |
| 22 | Okay, Allen Roth? Hello? (Phone | |
| 23 | dialing.) | |
| 24 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER ON PHONE: | |
| 25 | Allen Roth's office. | |
| | | |

| | | 12 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | MR. SLONE: Yes, Allen said he's | |
| 2 | trying to call back in. We | |
| 3 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER ON PHONE: | |
| 4 | Okay, hold on a second. | |
| 5 | MR. SLONE: If not, we'll just | |
| 6 | put we'll just do it on the cell phone. | |
| 7 | MR. ROTH: All right, this is | |
| 8 | Allen. We're back. | |
| 9 | MR. SLONE: Okay, great. So you | |
| 10 | have your backup music on, Allen. Okay, | |
| 11 | I'll turn that's on the other line. I'll | |
| 12 | turn that off. Okay, we're back. | |
| 13 | CONTINUATION OF EXAMINATION OF GEORGE SNYDER: | |
| 14 | BY MR. SLONE | |
| 15 | Q. Okay, Mr. Snyder, the last question, | |
| 16 | when was this company incorporated? | |
| 17 | A. In 2015. | |
| 18 | Q. Who are the officers? | |
| 19 | A. It was okay, I was going to | |
| 20 | elaborate on the on the corporation part | |
| 21 | 'cause that was kind of what brought us | |
| 22 | here. Or is that enough for you? | |
| 23 | Q. That's enough for right now. Just | |
| 24 | who are the officers now, or at the time of | |
| 25 | the filing? | |

| | 13 |
|---|--|
| A. My brother, Kash Snyder. | |
| Q. Kash, what was he? | |
| A. President. | |
| Q. And you're vice president, George | |
| Snyder? | |
| A. Yes. | |
| Q. Any other officers? | |
| A. No. | |
| Q. Who are the shareholders? | |
| A. There's a company called Accredited | |
| Business Consolidators Corp and | |
| Q. Could you speak up, please? | |
| A. Yes. There's a company called | |
| Accredited Business Consolidators Corp, and | |
| there's over a thousand shareholders, so we | |
| issued, issued shares. But I'm the majority | |
| shareholder. | |
| Q. How much do you own, what | |
| percentage? | |
| A. I think it's 51 percent. | |
| Q. I didn't see that Accredited | |
| creditors listed in your schedules. Is | |
| A. You know what, when we I'm going | |
| back to with Biros, I was 51 percent. With | |
| currently I'm 90 percent. | |
| | Q. Kash, what was he? A. President. Q. And you're vice president, George Snyder? A. Yes. Q. Any other officers? A. No. Q. Who are the shareholders? A. There's a company called Accredited Business Consolidators Corp and Q. Could you speak up, please? A. Yes. There's a company called Accredited Business Consolidators Corp, and there's over a thousand shareholders, so we issued, issued shares. But I'm the majority shareholder. Q. How much do you own, what percentage? A. I think it's 51 percent. Q. I didn't see that Accredited creditors listed in your schedules. Is A. You know what, when we I'm going back to with Biros, I was 51 percent. With |

| | 541 (a) MEETING OF CREDITORS - 3/3/2022 | |
|----|---|----|
| | | 14 |
| 1 | Q. You're 90 percent? | |
| 2 | A. We can send you a shareholder list. | |
| 3 | Q. Yeah, you should do that. Do they | |
| 4 | know that this company is in bankruptcy? | |
| 5 | A. We provided Otto with a list. | |
| 6 | Q. Well, he's so what? Who's John | |
| 7 | Biros? | |
| 8 | A. They and they probably don't know | |
| 9 | the bankruptcy. | |
| 10 | Q. It says he owns 25 percent of this | |
| 11 | company. | |
| 12 | A. Who is that? | |
| 13 | Q. John, on your statement, Question | |
| 14 | No. 28, list all the debtors, officers, | |
| 15 | directors, managing members, general | |
| 16 | partners, members in control, controlling | |
| 17 | shareholders, or other people in control of | |
| 18 | the debtor. You have one person listed, | |
| 19 | John Biros, 25 percent. It says a silent | |
| 20 | partner from inception. Your name's not | |
| 21 | listed. Kash isn't listed. No other names | |
| 22 | are listed here. So why don't you file an | |
| | | |

A. Okay.

23

24

25

Q. -- where we're coming from.

amended schedules so we know --

| | | 15 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | A. Silent partner. Okay, we'll file an | |
| 2 | amended. | |
| 3 | Q. How many employees did the company | |
| 4 | have when the bankruptcy was filed? | |
| 5 | A. None. | |
| 6 | Q. None. When's the last time the | |
| 7 | company had employees? | |
| 8 | A. Up till recently, we had there | |
| 9 | was always someone helping there. There was | |
| 10 | always about a half a dozen people helping | |
| 11 | at different times, you know, throughout the | |
| 12 | years. But just the just limited, you | |
| 13 | know, just a few hours a year. | |
| 14 | Q. Can you get me the records of that? | |
| 15 | Were the withholding taxes paid for the | |
| | | |

taxes for those employees? Were they issued W-2's?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Okay, I'll get you the records for the people that worked.
- Q. Give me copies of the W-2's for the last four years.
- A. Okay. But there wouldn't be any records 'cause they were -- they were contractors, not -- not -- you know, we didn't have W-2's.

| | | 16 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | Q. So they weren't employees? | |
| 2 | A. No. | |
| 3 | Q. Well, get me records of what, what | |
| 4 | they were paid. | |
| 5 | A. Okay. Past four years? | |
| 6 | Q. Yes. | |
| 7 | A. Will do. | |
| 8 | Q. Okay, your bankruptcy schedules said | |
| 9 | your gross revenues for 2021 were about | |
| 10 | \$13,000; for 2020 was about \$12,000. Do you | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | A. Yes. | |
| 13 | Q. Thirteen two for '21. Do you know | |
| 14 | what it would have been for 2019? | |
| 15 | A. Not right offhand. My brother would | |
| 16 | probably know that. | |
| 17 | Q. Well, was it in that same range? | |
| 18 | A. Probably pretty much about the same. | |
| 19 | (Inaudible) kind of estimate, so I would | |
| 20 | guess that 2019 would be about the same. | |
| 21 | Q. Okay. How about years prior to | |
| 22 | that, has it always been about that much? | |
| 23 | A. Yeah. Yeah, it's always been | |
| 24 | (Inaudible). | |
| 25 | Q. Okay. Does the company have an | |
| | | |

| | | 17 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | accountant? | |
| 2 | A. No. | |
| 3 | Q. When did the company file tax | |
| 4 | returns 2020 or 2021? | |
| 5 | A. No, we did not. | |
| 6 | Q. Did the company ever file tax | |
| 7 | returns? | |
| 8 | A. No. | |
| 9 | Q. Why? | |
| 10 | A. That was, in 2015 when we got it, | |
| 11 | Christine Biros and John Biros were silent | |
| 12 | partners, and everything was pretty much at | |
| 13 | their direction this whole time. And they, | |
| 14 | you know, they ordered us not to file the | |
| 15 | tax returns because they were indicted by | |
| 16 | the Attorney General. They wanted to wait | |
| 17 | until that was over, so we were just in kind | |
| 18 | of a holding pattern since the inception. | |
| 19 | And then at some point this lawsuit came | |
| 20 | about. | |
| 21 | O. Since the bank yeah, since the | |

Q. Since the bank -- yeah, since the bankruptcy was filed, have there been any effort to prepare tax returns?

22

23

24

25

A. Yes, I think we were looking for an accountant and we're just gathering our bank

statements and receipts, everything we're going to need for, to file tax returns, 'cause we anticipate the Judge had mentioned he was concerned and wanted tax returns, so we're preparing for that.

- Q. Has there been any payment to any officers or shareholders in the last two years?
 - A. The -- no.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

- Q. No? If I go back to years three and four, has there been any payments to officers or shareholders?
- A. No for three and four. But let me back up. The last question you asked, was that, you asked for the -- what year were you asking as far as the payments to --
- Q. Last two years. Well, let's say '22, '21, or '20.
- A. Yes, in 2021 the -- there was that tractor we had mentioned, the Kubota that was sold. There was money there and that was -- that was used to reimburse me for loans I provided to U Lock over the past six, seven years.
 - O. And how much was that?

| | 19 | |
|----|---|--|
| 1 | A. The sale of the tractor was \$45,000. | |
| 2 | Q. And you got the \$45,000? | |
| 3 | A. Most of it. | |
| 4 | Q. And that was | |
| 5 | A. From two thousand | |
| 6 | Q to reimburse you? | |
| 7 | A. Yes. | |
| 8 | Q. For loans? | |
| 9 | A. Yes. | |
| 10 | Q. Can you get me the information | |
| 11 | regarding this sale and when you got that | |
| 12 | money for the Kubota? | |
| 13 | A. Okay. Allen, could you piece of | |
| 14 | paper? | |
| 15 | Q. Anything else? | |
| 16 | A. No, I think that's it. Well, yeah, | |
| 17 | as far as what I paid back to my sister | |
| 18 | also, Tammy, I had to pay her back | |
| 19 | approximately \$7,000 for, she had loaned the | |
| 20 | company money for property taxes one year. | |
| 21 | Q. When was that done? | |
| 22 | A. (Inaudible) we anticipate getting | |
| 23 | our taxes done here in the next 90 days. | |
| 24 | Q. When was Tammy paid? Is that Tammy | |
| 25 | Snyder? | |
| | | |

| | 20 |) |
|----|---|---|
| 1 | A. Yes. Or Tammy, Tammy McCarl, M-C- | |
| 2 | C-A-R-L. | |
| 3 | Q. So she was paid \$7,000 to reimburse | |
| 4 | her for taxes? | |
| 5 | A. Yes. | |
| 6 | Q. And when, when was that done? | |
| 7 | A. Right after the sale of the Kubota. | |
| 8 | Q. Okay. | |
| 9 | A. That would have been probably | |
| 10 | December of 2021 or November maybe of 2021. | |
| 11 | Q. Okay, get me the information on | |
| 12 | both, on that sale and how the money was | |
| 13 | disbursed at that time then. | |
| 14 | A. Okay, great. Yeah, I'll get that to | |
| 15 | you. | |
| 16 | Q. Your attorney, Mr. Roth, was there | |
| 17 | any money paid to him for this bankruptcy | |
| 18 | yet at this time? | |
| 19 | A. Not yet. | |
| 20 | Q. Okay, there was a lawsuit in Federal | |
| 21 | Court that Shanni Snyder filed against the | |
| 22 | company last year, I believe, and a default | |
| 23 | judgment was taken. Why didn't the company | |
| 24 | defend that case? | |
| 25 | A. Well, like I said before, we didn't | |

| we didn't really have any defenses for |
|--|
| it. She had she had did the work. At |
| the time we didn't really consider her an |
| employee. She was just, you know, she was |
| doing the work and we had the agreement was, |
| you know, once we got everything together, |
| she would get something. And, you know, we |
| kind of thought she'd go away. We didn't |
| think she was going to follow through with |
| it. |

- Q. Well, if you didn't consider her an employee, why didn't you defend this?
 - A. Pardon me?

- Q. You said you didn't -- you didn't consider her --
 - A. (Inaudible).
- Q. -- as an employee. Was there any agreement made with her?
- A. Just that she would get something when, when we got our, you know, got everything off the ground. We didn't have money to defend it. We would have needed \$10,000 for an attorney at that point, because it's a corporation.
 - Q. So you were aware of the lawsuit

22 1 then; right? 2 Yes, I was served. 3 MR. SLONE: Okay, I'm going to 4 open up questions to other creditors. We'll 5 start with Sarah Wenrich. If you have any 6 questions, this would be a time. 7 going to limit, if we're going to drag this 8 on, we'll -- we'll take a pause and I'll get 9 my other cases and then we'll come back to 10 this. But I'll give you a few minutes now. 11 Sarah, do you have any questions? 12 Okay. Yes, I do. MS. WENRICH: 13 Thanks, Mr. Slone. 14 EXAMINATION OF GEORGE SNYDER: 15 BY MS. WENRICH Mr. Snyder, first off, with regard 16 17 to your statement earlier that you, that U 18 Lock had no employees and just had 19 contractors, and I just want to make sure I 2.0 heard you right. You say it was just about 21 a half a dozen people helping throughout the 22 year a couple hours a year; is that right? 23 Α. Yes. 2.4 Okay, so where does your \$99,000 25 claim against the company come from then,

and why wasn't it listed in the schedules?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- A. The \$99,000 was what Christine would owe me. We were -- Christine was in charge. She was the -- she was the silent partner, and things changed along the way and now this lawsuit came and as, as a result, any work I've done there over the past seven years I didn't get paid. So I never got any officer compensation or anything from her, so that those -- those stem from my wages, not -- not others.
- Q. And we don't -- we don't agree that she was a silent partner, but even if she was, a silent partner wouldn't have any control over the company; isn't that how a silent partner works? So I'm not sure, can you explain --
 - A. Well, now she's claiming --
- Q. -- how a silent partner would have control?
- A. Well, now she's not claiming to be a silent partner; she's claiming to be the owner, that over the past seven years that she was the owner, that that -- that doesn't leave me any compensation for officer salary

or wages, not even minimum wage for the past seven years.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

MR. SLONE: Well, is she --

- Q. I want to clarify, she's not the owner of the company. She's the owner of the property. So those are two different, two different issues, no ownership in the company; right? I mean --
- A. Well, either her or U Lock owes me, you know, at least minimum wage, but she controlled the company.
- Q. But, Mr. Snyder, you just said that you are not -- there are not employees.

 And, you know, does it appear on your personal tax returns, the compensation that you're owed or that --
 - A. Are you saying I'm not an employee?
- Q. You said that U Lock has no employees, so I'm not sure how you would be owed that money. I'm just, I'm trying to close the loop there, and it's not --
 - A. Well, I could --
- Q. Maybe I'm missing something, but it's not making sense.
 - A. Okay, well, we can file a brief and

describe the work that I've done and -
MR. SLONE: Why wasn't it listed
in your schedules? I think if I was owed
\$99,000, I'd mention it somewhere.

2.0

2.1

2.4

A. I could -- I could amend the schedules, but like I said, things changed from us being partners and them controlling the property. Now they're saying they own the property; it's constructive trust and it's under their direction. I did all this work for the past seven years. So they're kind of like, you know, for everything I did, I cleaned out lockers; I met with customers. I, you know, I developed the land. I cleaned the weeds, cut the grass, plowed the snow, did building maintenance, fixed the electrical service.

All this stuff was done, and it's just, there was no compensation whatsoever. And they just switched the game (Inaudible), switched it up in the middle here and went from being partners to owners, and then that puts me, you know, with, you know, no compensation for (Inaudible).

Q. Mr. Snyder, I'm not -- I'm not

disagreeing that you're a partner or an owner of U Lock, but again, I think that is a different question. And again, you are testifying today on behalf of U Lock, who you say has no employees, and yet you file a claim as an alleged employee, and they just, they don't --

- A. Well, then maybe --
- Q. -- match up.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- A. Maybe I'm, okay, maybe I'm using the wrong terminology. Maybe, like I said before, officer compensation. When I meant no employees, I meant other, there were no employees on the books. We didn't have a regular staff. Nobody was paid in that way.
- Q. So you said you had contractors, not employees, so do you have 1099's then, if you didn't have W-2's?
 - A. No, we don't have, no W-2's.
 - Q. Do you have -- do you have 1099's?
- A. Yeah. There are -- or there's not any 1099's because they -- they weren't enough to -- I think they all made less than five or six hundred dollars like per year.

 So like I said, they were just help. They

came in sometimes when they were needed if there was -- there was no -- nobody was on a 40-hour work week. But just me, like I said --

Q. Okay, so --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- A. -- I was entitled to at least minimum wage for the time I worked there or officer compensation.
- Q. So you, okay, so Ms. Snyder then, Shanni Snyder, your sister, if everyone made less than five or six hundred dollars a year, if she worked for four years, that would be around \$2,000; right?
- A. I wasn't talking about her 'cause we never -- she didn't make anything. We didn't pay her anything. And like I said, we didn't really even consider her an employee. She was my sister; she was helping out, and the arrangement was, once we got things together, she would make some money. So she kept track of her (Inaudible).
- Q. So is it your opinion that the default judgment that was obtained in District Court was not truthful and

fraudulent for \$260,000?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- A. Well, that's not what I said at all.
- Q. No, no, I'm -- I understand that you're saying you didn't consider her an employee, so I'm trying to get what the company's position on, because you had said you didn't fight it because you didn't have the legal, the money to pay the legal fees; but what is your position on that then if you don't consider her a real employee? And it sounds like people just helped out; their compensation would have been a couple hundred dollars a year. Why is that different there?
- A. I don't really have a position on that.
- Q. Okay. I guess I'll move on to the Kubota tractor. So who did it sell to? Who did you last sell the Kubota tractor to?
- A. Give me back the things I -- it was a private individual. I have, give me one second, I have some papers in front of me. Let me see if I can find his name.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. Do you have that? You know, I

| | | 29 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | apologize. I can get that to you, though. | |
| 2 | I can give to you the (Inaudible). Actually | |
| 3 | he did have a company. I can't remember the | |
| 4 | name of his company or his name. But I | |
| 5 | but I have all that information that I can | |
| 6 | get to you. | |
| 7 | Q. Okay. Yeah, that would be helpful I | |
| 8 | think and, you know, copy the Trustee on it | |
| 9 | as well. And would, so 45,000 | |
| 10 | A. (Inaudible). | |
| 11 | Q was what the tractor was sold | |
| 12 | for. How much did the company originally | |
| 13 | purchase it for and when? | |
| 14 | A. I don't know the exact amount, but I | |
| 15 | think it was around \$65,000. That was | |
| 16 | purchased in 2016. And Mr. Slone wants me | |
| 17 | to get everything around that sale to him, | |
| 18 | so I'll get all that information, the | |
| 19 | purchase date, the sale date, the person's | |
| 20 | name. I'll get all that to him. | |
| 21 | MS. WENRICH: Okay, all right. | |
| 22 | Mr. Otto, do you have any, any questions? | |
| 23 | MR. OTTO: Yes, I do. | |
| 24 | EXAMINATION OF GEORGE SNYDER: | |

BY MR. OTTO

| | | 30 |
|-----|--|----|
| 1 | Q. Mr. Snyder, who, who are the | |
| 2 | secretary and treasurer of U Lock? You're | |
| 3 | required under Pennsylvania law to have. | |
| 4 | Can you tell me who they are? | |
| 5 | A. Who the secretary and treasurer are? | |
| 6 | Q. That's correct. | |
| 7 | A. We just have two officers, me and | |
| 8 | Kash. I guess the treasurer and the | |
| 9 | secretary had to be (Inaudible) vice | |
| 10 | president and treasurer. So just between | |
| 11 | us, we fulfill all the roles of office. | |
| 12 | Q. Just one moment. | |
| 13 | That one. It's right up there. | |
| 14 | Sorry for the interruption. | |
| 15 | A. Okay. | |
| 16 | Q. Mr. Snyder, do you have any proof | |
| 17 | that either John or Christine Biros had | |
| 18 | anything to do with U Lock or the control of | |
| 19 | U Lock? Do you have any written evidence? | |
| 20 | A. As far as like a as far as a | |
| 21 | partnership agreement, you mean, or | |
| 22 | something like that? | |
| 23 | Q. Anything. You never issued shares, | |
| 2.4 | so or share certificates? | |

2.0

2.1

2.4

meetings. Every single Wednesday we went
to, they owned a bar named Caesar's, and me
and my brother went down there every single
Wednesday to meet Christine for our
meetings. And then also, John we met almost
every single day. And so I'm sure there's
some type of evidence, but there's -- we
don't have a written agreement as far as the
-- them directing the company.

- Q. Well, if you -- if you met at a bar, is there -- is there any -- I mean, did you ever keep written minutes?
- A. We have some documentation and we also have, you know, some photographs at times we met. So there is some types of evidence if we had to provide some type of evidence. I do think they claimed in the beginning of the lawsuit that they didn't even know who we were. In fact, they had served the lawsuit by advertising in the Law Journal, so I think John and -- John and Christine both denied our existence in the beginning.

So we do have some proof that we were -they knew very well who we were, and they

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

32

were trying to be silent partners or secret partners, I guess, they always told me because of the -- because of their indictment for whatever that was (Inaudible). We could get evidence and we could also do a deposition of John and also do a deposition of Christine. And their father was there as well, Bob Biros.

- Q. Well, I'm not going to get into the -- to the details, but as you already know, because we've been through this issue in State Court, my client denies everything that you've said. And you certainly have the right as an individual to walk into any bar, and if Christine or John happened to be there, then you can call that a meeting, but that doesn't mean that's what it was. Let me move on.
 - A. (Inaudible).
- Q. Excuse me, excuse me, Mr. Snyder, let -- let me move on.
 - A. (Inaudible).
- Q. You claim you made a property tax payment. When did you make that and how much was it and what years did it cover?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- A. I think that was, it was -- I think it was close to 7,000. I don't have the exact number in front of me. And that was, I actually can't even remember the -- what year it covered. But that would just be for one year. The property taxes are roughly 7,000 a year.
- Q. Do you know when you made that payment?
- A. No, it was -- my sister made it,

 Tammy. She made it by check. So we would

 have a record of that check we could

 provide.
- Q. Okay. In the -- in the corporate action you filed to petition for a reorganization, you stated that you had held a shareholders agreement, or I'm sorry, a shareholders meeting. Did you inform any of your 800-plus shareholders of that meeting?
- A. No, it was a -- it was a -- let me take a drink here for a second. It was just me. It was just the majority shareholders present. (Inaudible) majority shareholders.
- Q. Now, I don't -- I don't remember what the percentages were, but you listed

| Kash Snyder as a shareholder of a |
|--|
| substantial number of shares, much greater |
| than, than the 10 percent that you're |
| asserting that he might own if you own 90 |
| percent of the company. When did you |
| when did Mr. Snyder when did Kash Snyder |
| transfer his shares to you? Or is or is |
| your 90 percent assertion incorrect? |

- A. Well, there's -- there's -- there's over 400 million shares, and I think Kash has about 4 million.
- Q. That's not the number you listed in your -- in your minutes, in your minutes of the shareholders meeting.
- A. I gave you a list of the shareholders, didn't I?
- Q. You know what, that's -- whether you did or not is irrelevant in this, in this bankruptcy.
 - A. Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. But the point is, and I'm only talking about Kash Snyder at this point, so my question is, when did --
 - A. He testified (Inaudible).
 - Q. -- when did he transfer his shares

| | | 35 |
|-----|--|----|
| 1 | to you? Or is the 90 percent that you claim | |
| 2 | you own incorrect? | |
| 3 | A. No, Kash (Inaudible). | |
| 4 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And the | |
| 5 | (Inaudible). | |
| 6 | A. I could read you the I could read | |
| 7 | you yeah, I can | |
| 8 | MR. SLONE: Who else is speaking | |
| 9 | here? | |
| L 0 | Q. Who is speaking in the background? | |
| 1 | A. Nobody here. I think there's | |
| _2 | someone someone else's end is on the | |
| 13 | phone here. Just me and Allen sitting here. | |
| 4 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think | |
| 15 | they should, you know. | |
| L 6 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: Not me. | |
| _7 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think | |
| 8 ـ | they should. | |
| L 9 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: It's not me, | |
| 20 | Shanni. Mine's on mute. | |
| 21 | MR. SLONE: If this is going to | |
| 22 | go on, I'm going to ask that we resume later | |
| 23 | this afternoon and go through the rest of | |
| 24 | the questioning. I have 14 other cases to | |
| 25 | be heard this morning, so | |
| | | |

341 (a) MEETING OF CREDITORS - 9/9/2022

| | | 36 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | MR. OTTO: What time would you | |
| 2 | like to do that? | |
| 3 | MR. SLONE: How about 2:30? Call | |
| 4 | back in at 2:30. | |
| 5 | MS. WENRICH: That's, yeah, | |
| 6 | that's fine. | |
| 7 | MR. OTTO: That works for me. | |
| 8 | MR. SLONE: Okay? I'll keep | |
| 9 | everything here. Call back at 2:30 and be | |
| 10 | get on at 2:30 p.m. today, okay? | |
| 11 | MS. WENRICH: Thank you. | |
| 12 | MR. OTTO: All right, very good. | |
| 13 | MR. SLONE: Thank you. | |
| 14 | * * * * * * (The proceedings | |
| 15 | were recessed.) | |
| 16 | * * * * * | |
| 17 | MR. SLONE: Okay, we're back on | |
| 18 | the record in the U Lock case, 22-20823- | |
| 19 | GLT. This is the continuation of the 341(a) | |
| 20 | meeting which was started this morning. | |
| 21 | It's now 2:30 p.m. on September 9. | |
| 22 | When we left, Mr. Otto was asking | |
| 23 | questions. Mr. Otto, you can resume. | |
| 24 | CONTINUATION OF EXAMINATION OF GEORGE SNYDER: | |
| 25 | BY MR. OTTO | |
| | | |

- Q. Okay. First, Mr. Snyder, can you confirm the sale date of the Kubota equipment? I think you said it was December of 2021; is that correct?
- A. I actually think it was, I'm pretty sure it was November 15 of 2021.
 - O. November 15?
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. Okay.
- A. Correct.
- Q. Okay, okay. And you said you received \$45,000 for that?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. In your statement of assets and liabilities, among other things, you said that you had not been involved in any environmental, or that U Lock had not been involved in any judicial or administrative proceedings, and you had not been notified by any governmental unit otherwise that you may have -- that the debtor might be liable, and you had never notified any governmental unit of any release of hazardous material. That's in Document 65, Pages 9 and 10 of 19. And there's a couple of questions about

2.0

2.1

2.4

- that. First of all, U Lock was cited at least twice by North Huntingdon Township for sanitation and accumulation of rubbish and garbage, but you did not report that. Why didn't you report it?
- A. Well, it was my understanding

 Christine Biros went to the code enforcement officer of North Huntingdon and said, write, write my property up for as many violations as you can. So I think she was trying to get, you know, some, some strategy there she had. I went to the Township and he said he was not going to write me up; that he was just going to give me a verbal because --
- Q. Mr. Snyder, excuse me one minute.

 Mr. Snyder, you were cited on or U Lock was cited on September 5, 2019, and June 21, 2021, and that was well before a final determination had been made in the Biros v. U Lock case.
 - A. Okay, I was talking about --
- Q. And whether -- and whether, whether Christine Biros initiated that or not, you were cited; U Lock was cited by North Huntingdon Township. And when this comment

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

| \sim | \cap |
|--------|--------|
| ≺ | ч |
| \sim | _ |

or the statement to the Bankruptcy Court was filed, you did not report this. So my question is, why didn't you report it? Regardless of who instigated it, the Township issued this.

- Okay, yeah, my previous answer was talking about the most recent. You were talking about September 5 and what other date?
- September 5, 2019, and June 21, Q. 2021.
- So on those, my -- to the Okav. Α. best of my recollection, I believe they -that was just some garbage needed cleaned up. We cleaned it up. There was no environmental issue there. There was no hazardous material or anything like that. It was just a little bit of garbage, and that was resolved. And I think it was just a warning, not a citation. There was no fine that I was aware of.
- Q. But the -- but the question in the bankruptcy statement is not are you currently under citation; it's have you ever. So I go back to my question, which

you haven't answered yet, why didn't you disclose this?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- A. Well, what I -- what I said was, I think I didn't consider it a citation. It was just a warning to clean up some garbage. And we did that and they were -- the Township was satisfied. So I didn't think it was a citation. There was no fine or anything like that.
- Q. Did you discuss this with your attorney, Mr. Roth?
- A. I discussed pretty much everything with him over the years, so --
- Q. And he told you that you didn't have to file this, report this?
- A. If there's a mistake on that, we can we can certainly (Inaudible) clarify that on there or whatever Mr. Slone would like me to do. But that's my (Inaudible).
- Q. Well, let me take this one step further. The next question on that section, has the debtor notified any governmental unit of any release of hazardous materials? Now, this was filed in July of 2022, this year, about a month, maybe six weeks after

341 (a) MEETING OF CREDITORS - 9/9/2022

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

truth here?

the disclosure of PCB's on the site; and yet you say that you never notified any governmental unit of any release, but you testified in court that you had in fact notified the fire department. So what's the

I think, I don't -- I don't know what you mean by the truth, but I just think you misunderstood something. I never contacted the fire department. In fact, I think you guys testified that someone else was the initial person to see that fire. was driving past on the highway and I saw the fire in the parking lot and I pulled in. The fire department was already there. The police department was there. There was at least a dozen personnel from the two outfits. So maybe you misunderstood something, or unless I misspoke in trial, but I don't recall saying that 'cause I never -- I didn't call the fire department. They were there.

Q. So, so let me just make sure I understand, Mr. Snyder. At no time whatsoever did you go to North Huntingdon

Township to talk to either the police or the fire department about this event?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- A. When I was -- I think the next day,
 I believe, I went to the property and
 Christine Biros was there with the
 Commissioner of the Township, and they were
 talking about the event and they were
 standing over the -- over the -- over the -the (Inaudible).
- Q. Did you -- did you ever -- did you ever go to the North Huntingdon Township
 Building to report anything to the police or to the fire department about this event within the couple of days after it occurred?
- A. Well, I didn't finish answering what you asked me before. I did speak with the Commissioner. She was there with, you know, with (Inaudible).
- Q. No, I'm not asking you about what happened -- I'm not asking about what happened at the site.
 - A. (Inaudible) the Township Building.
- Q. I'm asking if you -- if you ever went to the Township Building to report to the police and the fire department about

this event?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

- A. I don't -- no, I did not go there to report anything because it was already reported; they already got there. I may have went there to ask for a police report or something of that nature or, but that was -- that was already reported. There was no need for me to report anything. And --
- Q. But at the end of the day, the answer to the 20, to this question, have you ever notified any governmental unit of any release of hazardous material, your answer to that was no, and that's incorrect, is it not?
- A. I'm not recalling what that -- no, that's not.
- Q. Well, let me move on. Have you ever paid anything to Mr. Roth for his representation of you in the State Court action Biros versus U Lock?

MR. ROTH: Objection.

A. Hold on.

MR. ROTH: I object to that question. That's irrelevant and it's none of his business anyway.

| 1 | Q. Well, in in a way it is relevant |
|----|---|
| 2 | because you have Mr. Roth has not filed a |
| 3 | claim in this case and he hasn't filed any |
| 4 | request for payment of fees. It's been |
| 5 | stated both in the State Court action and |
| 6 | this action that you had not paid him |
| 7 | because you were going to pay him something |
| 8 | of value when, when U Lock got turned |
| 9 | around. So my question is, do you owe, does |
| 10 | U Lock owe anything to Mr. Roth for legal |
| 11 | services? |
| 12 | A. He's never billed me to this point |
| 13 | as far as this bankruptcy goes. |
| 14 | Q. Do you think you are going to owe |
| 15 | him anything? |
| 16 | A. I don't really want to answer that |

A. I don't really want to answer that because I --

MR. SLONE: I think the question is, maybe I'm wrong, but -- this is Bob Slone -- I think the question is, does U Lock owe Mr. Roth anything, any money for legal services rendered at any time?

A. No, not right now.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- MR. SLONE: So the answer is no?
- A. No, just for the post bankruptcy.

Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

- A. But till then, no.
- Q. Okay, now, so, so let me -- let me go a little bit further on this in this way. You said earlier today that when Shanni Snyder's case against U Lock was filed, you did not defend it because you would have had to pay an attorney \$10,000 to represent U Lock. And yet, at that point in time, U Lock was represented by Mr. Roth, and all you would have had to do was ask him to go into court to represent you. If you could -- Mr. Roth represented you from 2017 to 2021, and if you never paid him anything for that matter, why would you worry about having to pay him for, for going into court for your sister?
- A. We -- that's our -- I think that's work product also.

MR. SLONE: Well, no, it's a question, is, 'cause we're trying to find out if there's a creditor, if U Lock has another creditor. But you're saying U Lock doesn't owe him any money?

A. Well, to clarify it, I said post

341 (a) MEETING OF CREDITORS - 9/9/2022

| | | 46 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | bankruptcy. So I | |
| 2 | MR. SLONE: No, I'm asking | |
| 3 | MR. ROTH: He asked | |
| 4 | MR. SLONE: for prior | |
| 5 | services. In other words, you know, does U | |
| 6 | Lock owe Mr. Roth any money; does he have a | |
| 7 | claim here? | |
| 8 | A. No, I don't think. But to answer | |
| 9 | his, I think the way, what he's kind of | |
| 10 | asking is, if Allen's representing me | |
| 11 | without charging at one point, then that | |
| 12 | means he'll always just represent me for | |
| 13 | free across the board on anything, is what | |
| 14 | I'm getting from | |
| 15 | MR. SLONE: Well, you can answer | |
| 16 | that yes or no. | |
| 17 | A his office. | |
| 18 | MR. SLONE: If you know. | |
| 19 | A. Pardon me? | |
| 20 | MR. SLONE: You can answer that | |
| 21 | if you know. | |
| 22 | A. Okay, yeah, I didn't think I | |
| 23 | didn't think that I could just walk in to | |
| 24 | him and have, say, come represent me in this | |
| 25 | for free. Plus, I didn't think the the | |

other part of that question, I said we didn't really think that lawsuit (Inaudible), and I had no idea that we'd bankruptcy at this point.

2.0

2.1

2.4

Q. (BY MR. OTTO) Well, let me -- let me continue with your sister's case for a moment. You said earlier that the reason that you didn't, among other things, the reason that you did not bother to go in and defend against this, this judgment was because you had no defenses. Well, the easy defense would have been for you to testify that she was not an employee, but you didn't bother to do that.

But you and your brother have both given, submitted sworn evidence, number one, that U Lock had no employees throughout that period of time that Shanni Snyder claims she worked for you, and second, that you did not owe anybody any money for employment. So why wouldn't you go in and at least simply state that? Even if you lost, you would at least have put up a bona fide defense against her case?

A. I didn't consider -- we didn't

341 (a) MEETING OF CREDITORS - 9/9/2022

| | 48 |
|----|--|
| 1 | consider her a current employee at the time, |
| 2 | and I still |
| 3 | Q. I understand that, but if |
| 4 | A. (Inaudible). |
| 5 | Q. But if you don't consider her an |
| 6 | employee, you have to assert that defense. |
| 7 | You can understand why, under the |
| 8 | circumstances, this does not sound like a |
| 9 | case of two arm's length parties arguing |
| 10 | about an employment situation. This sounds |
| 11 | more like a brother and sister deciding that |
| 12 | they need to get a judgment in order to file |
| 13 | a lien against real estate in another |
| 14 | county. |
| 15 | A. Yeah, that, that's absolutely not |
| 16 | the case. I mean, this whole thing is not |
| 17 | an arm's length. Biros, Christine and John |
| 18 | |
| 19 | Q. But you allowed your sister |
| 20 | A. (Inaudible). |
| 21 | Q. You allowed your sister to get a |
| 22 | default judgment against your company. And |
| 23 | it wasn't, you know, a default judgment of |
| 24 | \$100. It was 130,000. Why wouldn't you |
| 25 | even go into court to at least put up a |

- A. Like I said, we figured she'd go away.
- Q. Why would she go away? She got a default judgment. That's your sister.
 - A. (Inaudible).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. Do you talk to your sister?
- A. (Inaudible). Pardon me?
- Q. Never mind, that's a (Inaudible) question.
- A. Biros and I have known each other since I was a child. We've known each other for 45 years. So, and my sister, we've known each other since we were a child, child.

 I'm not here today to say nothing was -- everything was arm's length. That's not the truth. I was close with my sister. I was close with Biros. I was close with the mother, Liz Biros, Bob Biros.
- Q. Let -- let me -- let me move on because I don't want you to perjure yourself about the relationship you may have had with the Biros.
 - A. (Inaudible).
- Q. The -- there -- when the -- when title was transferred to you or to U Lock by

| the deeds from the Schur estates, there were |
|--|
| a number of trailers and containers on the |
| site. You have in the last couple months, |
| or maybe more than a couple months, |
| transferred a number of those containers and |
| trailers off the site. Why did you transfer |
| them or move them and where are they? |

- A. I believe Mr. Slone said to start moving some of my things out of there, so that would explain the containers. What about the -- what trailers are you referring to? 'Cause I don't recall moving trailers out of there.
- Q. Well, there were a number -- let me put it this way. Are you saying that, that you own all of those containers that used to be on the U Lock site?
- A. Are you referring to the ten shipping containers?
- Q. Yes. Are you -- are you saying that you personally, George Snyder, owns those?
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. When was title transferred to them?
- A. There is no title. Those are shipping containers. They're just a metal

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

| storage box. I | don't believe they have | any |
|----------------|-------------------------|-------|
| VIN numbers or | titles or anything like | that. |
| But I believe | I purchased those about | 20 |
| years ago. | | |

- Q. Well, I don't think that's correct because those were all sitting on the property when the property was owned by the Schur estate, and those items were assigned to you by the Schur estate in conjunction with the transfer of title by the Schur estate. So those containers appear to be owned by U Lock, not George Snyder?
- A. Yeah, that's incorrect. I saw that in one of the (Inaudible).
- Q. And you've already testified in court on the first hearing that those containers are worth \$6,000 apiece?
- A. No, I was talking about the -- the white water tank. They're 10,000-gallon tanks. They're white poly tanks. That's what I was referring to, not the shipping.
- Q. No, we were -- no, you were specifically talking about, about containers, the shipping containers.
 - A. When was that?

Q. At the first hearing.

2.0

2.1

2.4

- A. Okay. If someone asked me the value, I don't know what that -- the value the changes over time with those, but the (Inaudible).
- Q. Well, the question is, do you have any proof that title of those containers and trailers was transferred to you, as opposed to being still owned by U Lock?
- A. Yeah, they were -- well, there's no proof as far as the title goes or whatever, but I had -- I was a tenant at U Lock when the -- the old man who owned it, his name was Nick Schur, and I've been a tenant there for I believe 22 years. So when you -- I saw that aerial picture you showed with tops of tractor-trailers and tanks and containers and things. Just because there was an aerial photo doesn't mean -- like most, a lot of that stuff belonged to tenants. And so that was --
- Q. Do you have any proof that they were -- that they belonged to you before the property was purchased from the Schur estates?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- I'm not sure. I'd have to look. mean, that's going back 22 years. But I could see if I have any records of it. a lot of that big heavy equipment there was And as you know, a lot of the big mine. heavy equipment that Glenn Mowry is claiming himself, there was a guy named Vince and there was all kind of other tenants there, and there's another tractor-trailer I think just left today out of there that belonged to someone from Maryland. So that aerial photo isn't really proof that or that's not really showing ownership of anything. fact, it's very misleading. It's very (Inaudible).
- Q. Let me -- let me jump into that since you brought it up. Let me ask you about the orange trailer. Who was the renter who had that stored on your site?
- A. I believe the company's name is Schapiro Whitehouse.
- Q. No, because they -- we've -- we've spoken to them and they had told us that they rented to someone else. And so the question is not -- it's not Whitehouse &

2.0

2.1

2.4

Schapiro. They own the trailer, but they rented it to somebody else who then stored it on your site. So the question is, who was renting space on your site to store that trailer?

- A. They -- they were the contact. They were the ones who made the arrangements.

 But they did tell me now recently, you know, this past couple days or this month, that there was some thirty or some third party involved. But that's -- they said that's between them, not on our end. So they -- they were the ones who (Inaudible).
- Q. Well, it's my understanding -- it's my understanding that Whitehouse & Schapiro now is claiming that they shouldn't have to have paid the rent because they rented the trailer to somebody else who stored it on your site. Did you ever have any direct contact with Whitehouse & Schapiro when that trailer was originally put on your site?
- A. That was my only contact. And she just told me the other day she didn't want to pay 'cause she said the Biros family damaged the trailer and they made it

| 1 | inaccessible. She said she had to pay a |
|----|---|
| 2 | thousand dollars for a truck to come out to |
| 3 | not be able to pick, get her get her |
| 4 | trailer. So she said she (Inaudible), that |
| 5 | they had to pay, someone's going to have to |
| 6 | pay for that. |
| 7 | But she never told me that she didn't want |
| 8 | to pay it because it wasn't hers. In fact, |
| 9 | she said it's their trailer, they want it |
| 10 | back, and they want they want to pay and |
| 11 | square up, and she did immediately. And |
| 12 | then it got Biros damaged it. And we |
| 13 | have video footage (Inaudible). |
| 14 | Q. How long how long was how long |
| 15 | was that trailer on the site? |
| 16 | A. I believe two years, maybe two years |
| 17 | and two months. |
| 18 | Q. So that, that trailer showed up on |
| 19 | the site in 2020? |
| 20 | A. I believe it was November of 2020 if |

- A. I believe it was November of 2020 if my memory serves me right.
- Q. And you don't know who entered into a rental agreement with you to (Inaudible) a trailer there?
 - A. (Inaudible).

22

23

24

341 (a) MEETING OF CREDITORS - 9/9/2022

| | | 56 |
|-----|--|----|
| 1 | Q. Because you apparently never | |
| 2 | collected any rent for it? | |
| 3 | A. Pardon me? | |
| 4 | Q. Well, Whitehouse & Schapiro paid the | |
| 5 | Trustee for a couple of years of rent. So | |
| 6 | if they had paid you, then they would | |
| 7 | certainly object to paying the Trustee and | |
| 8 | they would they would have claimed that | |
| 9 | they had paid you. But apparently they | |
| L O | didn't pay you, and apparently whoever | |
| 1 | entered into the agreement with you didn't | |
| _2 | pay you either, unless you accepted cash for | |
| 13 | it? | |
| 4 | A. No, they they | |
| 15 | Q. But you still haven't who, who is | |
| L 6 | who is the person, who is the individual | |
| L 7 | who, who negotiated with you to store that | |
| 8 . | trailer on the site? | |
| _9 | A. It was a girl from Whitehouse & | |
| 20 | Schapiro. | |
| 21 | Q. Okay. | |
| 22 | A. I believe her (Inaudible). | |
| 23 | Q. So when we call Whitehouse & | |
| 24 | Schapiro and ask them if they negotiated for | |
| 25 | that truck to be there, they're going to say | |

| | | 57 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | yep, we talked to George? | |
| 2 | A. I don't know what they're going to | |
| 3 | say. | |
| 4 | Q. 'Cause you know we are going to ask | |
| 5 | them. We are going to ask them that | |
| 6 | question. | |
| 7 | A. But I could clarify that if you'll | |
| 8 | let me. I spoke with a girl Loretta at | |
| 9 | Whitehouse | |
| 10 | Q. Oh, please do. | |
| 11 | A. Pardon me? | |
| 12 | Q. I said please clarify 'cause we're | |
| 13 | all confused. | |
| 14 | A. Well, I answered you already, but | |
| 15 | I'll say it, you know, more clearly | |
| 16 | hopefully. The only person I dealt with was | |
| 17 | Whitehouse & Schapiro. I believe a woman | |
| 18 | named Loretta called and made all the | |
| 19 | arrangements. Never met her in person. | |
| 20 | They're from out of state. She did all this | |
| 21 | over the phone. A couple days later | |
| 22 | (Inaudible). | |
| 23 | Q. And this was in 2020? | |
| 24 | A. Yes. | |
| 25 | Q. Okay. | |

2.0

2.1

2.4

A. The trailer showed up on the lot. I never collected any rent from them ever in the two years. Then when I spoke with Whitehouse & Schapiro most recently, a woman named Doll (Phonetic spelling) is who I spoke with. She said Loretta no longer works for them, she said, but it is their trailer and they want to square up and they'll send out a check immediately, which they did, and they sent it to Mr. Slone.

That was it. I don't know -- I didn't talk to or meet or know this third party that they talked about. Supposedly they told me that it's their trailer. Sometimes they rent their trailers and third parties do business out of their trailers. But I never met that guy, never seen him. Never seen him, never talked to him on the phone. And that was it. That's all the knowledge I have on that.

Q. During, during the Biros versus U

Lock state case, did you disclose that you

were the president and Kash Snyder I believe

was secretary? You now tell us that Kash

Snyder is president and you're vice

And you do not have a secretary or

25

Q.

| | | 60 |
|-----|---|----|
| 1 | treasurer? | |
| 2 | A. No, we we're also we hold all | |
| 3 | the positions, so I'm everything. | |
| 4 | Q. So you're both you are you are | |
| 5 | the secretary and treasurer? | |
| 6 | A. Yes. | |
| 7 | Q. Is that right? Okay. | |
| 8 | A. Yes. | |
| 9 | Q. This morning you told us that you | |
| L 0 | own 90 percent of U Lock; right? | |
| 1 | A. Yeah, I think you were asking no, | |
| _2 | I'm not I wasn't really sure of the | |
| 13 | percentages. I know more the you were | |
| 4 | talking about something very specific, and | |
| _5 | we were I had a meeting with Kash over | |
| L 6 | the phone because he hasn't been available. | |
| _7 | You were talking about the motion to | |
| 8 . | convert. So I had a meeting with him, and | |
| L 9 | we, you know, we both agreed to the motion | |
| 20 | to convert, so | |
| 21 | Q. Well, you you have | |
| 22 | A. (Inaudible). | |
| 23 | Q. You have a corporate resolution of U | |
| 24 | Lock. It says that a meeting of | |
| 25 | shareholders on June 30, 2022, among other | |
| | | |

dividends, but we didn't issue any dividends because there was no profit.

- Q. But you had them listed as shareholders but never informed them that they were shareholders; is that correct?
- A. No, they're aware they're shareholders. We just didn't notify them of the --
 - Q. Really?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- A. -- the motion to convert because it was a unanimous vote anyways that we had 98 percent approval, so --
- Q. Well, I can tell you that I have spoken to one of your shareholders, and his first question when I asked him if he was an owner of U Lock shares was, who is U Lock? And I can assure you that he knows -- he knew nothing when I asked him in 2019, and he knew -- he knew nothing when I asked him two months ago. So if you have any evidence that you've informed all your shareholders, you might want to gather it up, because these people don't know.
- A. So we didn't notify them, so (Inaudible).

- Q. Let me move on to my next -- my next area. You've told us that in the last four years you have not had any employees; is that correct? That was your testimony this morning?
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. Okay. So I come back to your sister. If you had no employees in that four-year period, how does she have a claim to maintain?
- A. Well, I guess the answer to that question --
 - Q. Why didn't you defend it?
- A. -- is we have no -- we had no employees on the payroll. So maybe that was a better answer. Maybe I, you know, should have said it that way.
- Q. Well, does that mean you have employees who are not on the payroll?
- A. I explained my sister's situation, yes.
- Q. Well, let me ask the question again.

 Does that mean that you had employees who

 were not on your payroll?
 - A. We had workers. They were people

that worked there that weren't employees; they weren't on the payroll, but they were people that worked.

- Q. Well, let -- let me -- let me ask it this way. I concede that you had independent contractors for whom you paid some amount for small jobs and periodically, okay?
 - A. Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. But Shanni Snyder claims that she, she worked for you for an extended period of time on a continuous four-year basis. And you're now telling us that you didn't have any employees on the payroll. So my question is, did you have employees who were not on the payroll?
- A. Yes, me, Kash, and Shanni all worked.
- Q. And you were not on a payroll? Did you report taxes to the IRS, payroll taxes?
- A. We, no, never received any pay. We just worked. Shanni, you know, we didn't -- she worked for U Lock, but we didn't really consider her an employee. She's my sister, and I thought it was more of a favor and the understanding was when we developed the

| property, she would get something. As I |
|--|
| said in court, you know, I think my brother |
| might have said that he thought it was |
| sisterly love. But anyhow, she was doing the |
| camera stuff and she was driving through, |
| you know, ten times a week (Inaudible). |

- Q. Well, you said in discovery that was provided as a result of a request from me to your counsel, Mr. Roth, you signed, you personally, George Snyder, signed a document that said you had no employees; U Lock has no employees?
 - A. Yeah, at that time (Inaudible).
 - Q. What's that?
- A. Yes, and at that time that was the (Inaudible).
 - O. Well --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- A. I didn't hear anything about this lawsuit (Inaudible).
- Q. Well, Shanni Snyder, your sister claims that she worked for you continuously from 2016 to 2020, and that covers the period of time that I asked the question.

 And in court I asked your brother if she had any connection to U Lock and he said no.

That sounds pretty clear to me that she didn't have a position as an employee or -- or in any fashion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

But you're now telling us that in fact she was an employee and that she is entitled to a salary of 130,000, which has now been doubled by the Federal Court to \$260,000, which you did not defend on U Lock's behalf?

- A. I think if I recall (Inaudible).
- Q. Even though, even though your testimony is that she was not an employee?
- A. Well, I think, I think, like I said, it's been a couple years, but if I remember correctly, I think you asked this, these same questions of me and my brother Kash, and I think we did tell you that she worked there, and you said why, and I think someone said sisterly love and helping us out or whatever. And that's what we thought at the time. She wasn't (Inaudible).
- Q. No, that's -- that's incorrect. I asked the question whether she helped on the legal pleadings, and then I asked whether she had anything to do with U Lock. And the answer to the second question, which is

whether she had anything to do with U Lock, and the answer to that question is no.

A. (Inaudible).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. There were two parts to that question. One was her involvement in the pleadings and the legal filing, and the second was whether she had any involvement with U Lock, and the answer to whether she had anything to do with U Lock was no. And your statement --
 - A. I don't recall.
- Q. -- in discovery was you had no -- U Lock had no employees?
- A. Yeah, employees get wages, and she wasn't getting any wages. She got nothing. So that's probably why, if that's how I answered it, if it is (Inaudible).
- Q. Okay. It still begs the question why you didn't defend it in court, but let's move on. You claim that, that you had an outstanding loan from U Lock or to U Lock, that you loaned U Lock some amount of money for which you repaid yourself when you sold the Kubota tractor and you got \$38,000; is that right? That's what you testified this

| | | 68 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | morning? | |
| 2 | Are you there? Hello? Anybody there? | |
| 3 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: I'm here. | |
| 4 | MR. SLONE: Allen, Allen, are you | |
| 5 | there, Allen and George? | |
| 6 | MR. OTTO: Mr. Slone, that's | |
| 7 | twice in two days, or in one day. | |
| 8 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: Do you have | |
| 9 | to call them? | |
| 10 | MR. SLONE: We'll have to call | |
| 11 | Allen's office again. Shoot, where's his | |
| 12 | number? Here it is. (Phone dialing.) | |
| 13 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER ON PHONE: | |
| 14 | Get disconnected again? | |
| 15 | MR. SLONE: Yes, we did. | |
| 16 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER ON PHONE: | |
| 17 | Hold on. Hang up. | |
| 18 | MR. ROTH: Yeah, hello. | |
| 19 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER ON PHONE: | |
| 20 | No, hang up. | |
| 21 | MR. SLONE: Allen, are you back? | |
| 22 | MR. GEORGE SNYDER: Yeah, we're | |
| 23 | back. Can you hear me? We're good. | |
| 24 | MR. SLONE: Yes, we can hear you. | |
| 25 | Go ahead. | |
| | | |

| | | 69 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | MR. GEORGE SNYDER: Okay, we must | |
| 2 | have got disconnected. | |
| 3 | CONTINUATION OF EXAMINATION OF GEORGE SNYDER: | |
| 4 | BY MR. OTTO | |
| 5 | Q. Mr. Snyder, my last question was, | |
| 6 | you paid you paid yourself back in, after | |
| 7 | you got payment for the Kubota; is that | |
| 8 | correct? | |
| 9 | A. But not not for wages. I didn't | |
| 10 | pay anything for wages. | |
| 11 | Q. No, I'm just but you said you had | |
| 12 | a loan outstanding | |
| 13 | A. Yes, a loan. | |
| 14 | Q that you had made to U Lock, and | |
| 15 | that, and you repaid yourself back for that; | |
| 16 | is that correct? | |
| 17 | A. Correct. | |
| 18 | Q. Okay. Were there did anybody | |
| 19 | else loan money to the company? | |
| 20 | A. Yeah, my sister Tammy. | |
| 21 | Q. Was that the money for the taxes? | |
| 22 | A. Yes, the | |
| 23 | Q. Okay. | |
| 24 | A. I believe it was 7,000. | |
| 25 | Q. Anybody else? | |
| | | |

- A. I believe my brother Kash did. Biros did.
 - Q. How much did you brother loan?
 - A. I'm not really sure.
- Q. Okay. Let's see. In your statement, there's a question of whether the -- whether U Lock has any accounts receivable, and you answered no; and yet you have this list of tenants, many of which have never made rental payments. Don't you keep any records of who pays you?
 - A. Well --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. And who hasn't paid you?
- A. Yeah, there are some records. I was kind of playing catch-up 'cause my brother was, you know, my brother was, you know, he wasn't around. So we provided the Trustee with everything we had, and then I discussed it personally with Mr. Slone, a couple things, like when that truck came up and, you know, we contacted them and --
- Q. So there are a lot of renters that, that have not paid money, so you never made any, took any effort to collect from them or to get rid of their property; is that

| | 7 | 1 |
|----|---|---|
| 1 | correct? | |
| 2 | A. Well, we're attempting that now. A | |
| 3 | lot of a lot of the tenants are | |
| 4 | Q. Well, why did why did it | |
| 5 | A. (Inaudible). | |
| 6 | Q. Why did it take bankruptcy to get | |
| 7 | you to start taking action? | |
| 8 | A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear anything. | |
| 9 | I was talking. | |
| 10 | MR. SLONE: Let's one talk, one | |
| 11 | person at a time here. | |
| 12 | Q. Why did it take | |
| 13 | MR. SLONE: Go ahead. | |
| 14 | Q. Why, why did it take the bankruptcy | |
| 15 | for you to start trying to collect past | |
| 16 | rents? | |
| 17 | A. Well, because Christine didn't want | |
| 18 | her name on anything, so she told us not to | |
| 19 | sue anybody and she didn't want any, you | |
| 20 | know, anything coming up in court or | |
| 21 | anything like that until after, so we just | |
| 22 | didn't do anything. | |
| 23 | Q. You understand that Christine is | |
| 24 | going to tell you that that's not true? | |
| 25 | And, and whether it's true or not | |
| | | |

A. (Inaudible).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. -- you're supposed to be president
 -- you're supposed to be president of this
 corporation, and you're responsible for
 trying to make it work, and it apparently
 has not?
- A. Well, like I said, most of those people are willing to pay. Anybody, in my experience, anybody that has stuff stored there is more than willing to pay. Even a great example is the lady who just paid \$3,000 because they want their stuff. But it's very difficult 'cause Bob Biros and Christine and their family and Andy and everybody is down there destroying all the tenants' things, blocking access to their stuff. And I'm getting all kind of threats now that they're not going to pay and they're going to sue and they're making some (Inaudible).
- Q. Have you ever -- have you referred all these communications to the Trustee?
- A. I let the Trustee know what I've been going through, yeah.
 - Q. So you've been receiving threats

he, he's going to be discharged I think later this month. So we -- we didn't even have money to collect or to sue people. Christine didn't want -- you know, she's the one that had the money, but she didn't provide any for us to go after these people (Inaudible).

- So the long and the short of it is, 0. this is not a viable company unless you get Christine Biros to jump in and pay for everything?
 - Α. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

- Is that what you're telling us? 0.
- There -- no, not at all. There's plenty of people with money that would love to be involved. But Christine got involved saying she'd take the money or, you know, she was going to give us the money, and then she tried to take over the whole property by saying what she said in court and switching this whole thing around.

So she -- we tried to pay her back the money we owed her. Ever since the beginning she will not take the money back. offered her interest, everything to make her

| whole, and they just keep saying they want |
|--|
| the they want the property, they want the |
| property. They said it's a loan but we don't |
| want paid back; we just want the property. |
| So that instead of just foreclosing on the |
| loan, which would have enabled us to pay |
| them off, she did this, this crazy whole |
| thing saying she didn't know who we were. |
| We went to court. They got a default |
| judgment on us. Then we had to open the |
| judgment. Then we end up in court and they |
| just, they weren't truthful on almost |
| anything they've said on the stand, so |

- Q. Mr. Snyder, your recollection of this legal case is, is not the same as either mine or Ms. Biros. And I think before you continue to misstate the actions involved, you might want to go back and look at things like the docket and talk to your counsel who was also there.
 - A. Well, this is true (Inaudible).
- Q. Who maintains all -- who maintains all of your -- who maintains all of your books and records; is it you?
 - A. No, Kash does more of that than me.

I have some access. I have access now to some records, but I haven't been able to, you know, really see him in person because he's at a medical facility. But when --

- Q. One of the questions --
- A. (Inaudible).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. One of the questions here is, list all firms or individuals who were in possession of the debtor's books of account and records when this case was filed, and your answer was none. And you gave no explanation of why they were unavailable.
 - A. (Inaudible.)
- Q. Is it -- is it -- is it your testimony -- is it your testimony that Kash Snyder has all this stuff and you just can't get to it 'cause he's in an institution?
- A. I have some stuff, but if there's anything missing, then he would be the -- he would be the one to have that.
- Q. Okay. In your statement there's a question of, within one year before filing this case, did the debtor provide an insider with the value in any form, including salary, other compensation, draws, bonuses,

| | | 77 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | loans, credits on loans, stock redemptions | |
| 2 | and options exercised, and you say no; is | |
| 3 | that correct? | |
| 4 | A. Are you looking at the schedule? | |
| 5 | Q. I am. | |
| 6 | A. What page is that? I was trying to | |
| 7 | follow along with you. | |
| 8 | Q. That is Page, hold on, Page 13 of | |
| 9 | 19, Document No. 65, Question 30. | |
| 10 | A. This is Page 13? | |
| 11 | Q. That's correct. | |
| 12 | A. And what is your question? | |
| 13 | MR. SLONE: Question No. 30. | |
| 14 | Q. I'm you just I'm just asking | |
| 15 | you if your answer to No. 30 is correct? | |
| 16 | A. I'm sorry, trying to find Page 13. | |
| 17 | Q. Yep, down at the bottom. Question | |
| 18 | 30. | |
| 19 | A. I didn't get a salary and I had | |
| 20 | you know, everything, I received repayments | |
| 21 | on the loans, but no compensation, no | |
| 22 | salary. | |
| 23 | Q. So, so this | |
| 24 | A. (Inaudible). | |
| 25 | Q. This question, your answer to this | |

| | | 78 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | question is not correct? | |
| 2 | A. Yeah, the way I read it, the way I | |
| 3 | read it, I thought it meant salary, and I | |
| 4 | didn't receive any salary or any payments, | |
| 5 | no dividends. | |
| 6 | Q. Let me move on. What, what | |
| 7 | utilities are at the property at 14140? | |
| 8 | A. I believe electric service. I think | |
| 9 | there are sewage and water taps there, but I | |
| 10 | don't believe U Lock gets a bill for those. | |
| 11 | Q. How about cable? | |
| 12 | A. I don't no, no cable. | |
| 13 | Q. Okay. Do you have a camera system | |
| 14 | at the at the property? | |
| 15 | A. Yes. | |
| 16 | Q. Where are the cameras located? | |
| 17 | A. We kind of have cameras there to, | |
| 18 | you know, because the Biros are still | |
| 19 | (Inaudible) for a lot of things. I don't | |
| 20 | know, do I have to tell you the exact | |
| 21 | locations as to those cameras since your | |
| 22 | client are the perpetrator? | |
| 23 | MR. SLONE: Just say how many | |
| 24 | cameras are there. | |
| 25 | A. I believe there's I believe | |

| | | 79 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | there's about ten cameras there. And they | |
| 2 | face | |
| 3 | Q. Well, let me ask you this, Mr | |
| 4 | A. (Inaudible). | |
| 5 | Q. Mr. Snyder. | |
| 6 | A. (Inaudible). | |
| 7 | Q. How how does information from | |
| 8 | those cameras get to some other location if | |
| 9 | you don't have cable? | |
| 10 | A. Well, there's I believe there's | |
| 11 | WiFi at the property, but I think it's the | |
| 12 | motel's WiFi or someone else's and | |
| 13 | Q. Oh, so you you | |
| 14 | A. (Inaudible). | |
| 15 | Q. You tap into the you tap into | |
| 16 | somebody else's WiFi? Did did they give | |
| 17 | you consent to do that? | |
| 18 | A. No, I don't no, I don't control | |
| 19 | that camera system, so the one I | |
| 20 | Q. Who does? | |
| 21 | A. The one I control is closed circuit | |
| 22 | and it's not it does not go over WiFi. | |
| 23 | Q. So it's not remotely available? | |
| 24 | A. The one that I | |
| 25 | Q. Is that correct? | |
| | | |

| - | m1 | 1 |
|----|----------|----------|
| Α. | 'l'hat's | correct. |

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. Okay. So how could Shanni Snyder monitor your camera system, if it's closed-circuit and not remotely available, how could she do that for four years?
- A. Well, she had the -- no, I, the one I control is closed-circuit and not -- I don't do it, you know, 'cause my sister does, I believe.
- Q. Well, where -- but it's -- but it's U Lock's system; right? So you're telling me she owns the cameras that monitor U Lock?
 - A. I believe so.
- Q. So she owns the camera system at the U Lock property; is that correct?
- A. Some of their -- there's multiple camera systems there, because some of the tenants even have their own systems, I believe. But, yes, she owns her own system, and then the one I have access to is (Inaudible).
- Q. How, how is her -- how is her system accessible remotely? Where is the WiFi system that, that allows that to happen?
 - A. I'm not sure. I know we don't have

WiFi at the time, but, you know, since -- I don't think we've had it (Inaudible).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- 0. Well, that was a four-year period where, where she had -- she claims she had access to cameras. You're telling me that you only have a closed-circuit camera, so that couldn't have been -- that couldn't have been what she was using. So she's got her own camera system; is that, is that what you're telling us?
- A. Yes, she has her own. I think she has a -- I think it's called a Dropcam She's a little more technological savvy than me. Mine's kind of like oldschool camera, I mean, but it's -- hers has I think (Inaudible).
- So if we get into the details of Ο. this camera system with her when her claim is, is heard by the District Court, which she's appealed, then she'll understand perfectly how this camera system works?
- Well, I know she understands better Α. than me. I'm not -- I'm not real -- like I said, mine's the old-fashioned kind. not old-fashioned; it's a high-resolution, I

| | | 82 |
|-----|---|----|
| 1 | mean, but it's just not I don't I | |
| 2 | don't look at my camera systems on like my | |
| 3 | cell phone. She does all that. She has all | |
| 4 | the cellular service and she does that sort | |
| 5 | of thing. | |
| 6 | Q. Okay. | |
| 7 | A. I don't know the (Inaudible) on | |
| 8 | that. | |
| 9 | Q. There is currently located on the | |
| L 0 | property a red car? | |
| 1 | A. Yes. | |
| _2 | Q. Pretty hard to miss if you drive on | |
| L3 | who owns that? | |
| 4 | A. The Honda, are you referring to the | |
| _5 | Honda, the red Honda? | |
| L 6 | Q. I'm only I don't remember what | |
| _7 | brand it was. I'm only aware of one red car | |
| 8 . | on that site at this point. | |
| _9 | A. Yeah, right in front of the | |
| 20 | building? That would be | |
| 21 | Q. Yeah, who owns that? | |
| 22 | A. My brother Kash. That's his car. | |
| 23 | Q. That's Kash's car? Why is his car | |
| 24 | still there? It's obviously not operable? | |
| 25 | A. Yeah, I'm not sure. Like, like I | |

2.0

2.1

2.4

told you before, I don't want to keep repeating. I mean, I feel bad having to keep repeat it, but, you know, there's so much contention there. Biros come down there, kicked me off the property, kicked people off the property. They blocked his car in. You can't get a -- I don't even know if you can get a tow truck back to his car at this point.

They covered almost all the roads except

They covered almost all the roads except for one, and so it's very difficult for anybody to get anything down there. The whole family shows up, Bob Biros, Christine Biros, her son Scotty Biros, Andy Biros, John Biros. They're like a swarm of bees down there and they're harassing everybody, and they're moving stuff around with dozers and backhoes and taking people's property and damaging it. They're pushing everything into a pile. One minute they say it's garbage (Inaudible).

- Q. You're prepared -- you're prepared to back up these statements in court, I assume, with evidence?
 - A. Pardon me?

| | 84 |
|----|--|
| 1 | Q. But the mean but in the meantime |
| 2 | · |
| 3 | A. (Inaudible). |
| 4 | Q the Trustee has, Mr. Snyder, the |
| 5 | Trustee has allowed you pretty much |
| 6 | unlimited access to the site, and you've |
| 7 | and you've moved a lot of stuff off this |
| 8 | site without interference from the Biros. |
| 9 | So the question is |
| 10 | A. That's not true. I (Inaudible). |
| 11 | Q why is Kash Snyder's broken |
| 12 | excuse me, let me finish my question, |
| 13 | please. |
| 14 | A. (Inaudible). |
| 15 | Q. Why is Mr your brother's red car |
| 16 | still on the site? It's clearly not |
| 17 | operable and it could be moved just as the |
| 18 | other cars were? |
| 19 | A. Well, I it that probably |
| 20 | I'm guessing it wasn't moved by Kash because |
| 21 | he's been in a facility since I believe June |
| 22 | or July. I could probably get, you know, |
| 23 | permission from Kash and work with Mr. Slone |
| 24 | to get that car out of there, but it's very |
| 25 | difficult to do anything. And I disagree |
| | |

| | | 85 |
|-----|--|----|
| 1 | with you saying I got a lot of stuff out of | |
| 2 | there. I don't think I got a couple percent | |
| 3 | of stuff out of there. We took one | |
| 4 | truckload of pallets (Inaudible). | |
| 5 | Q. All of those all of those | |
| 6 | shipping containers are gone and most of the | |
| 7 | trailers are gone? | |
| 8 | A. Yeah, I don't | |
| 9 | Q. So | |
| L 0 | A. I don't agree with you. I don't | |
| 1 | think there was I think there was only | |
| _2 | one trailer that I know of that left the | |
| 13 | site. And the shipping containers were | |
| 4 | moved months ago. I'm not in agreement with | |
| L 5 | you on your, you know, what you're | |
| 6 | Q. Who paid who paid the insurance | |
| _7 | premium for the insurance on the site? | |
| 8 . | A. I paid that personally. | |
| 9 | Q. Okay. Who is the principal of USAAG | |
| 20 | that you've been dealing with? | |
| 21 | A. Well, I was talking to Mike Lavinsky | |
| 22 | (Phonetic spelling). | |
| 23 | Q. Do you have contact information for | |
| 24 | him? | |

A. Not in front of me.

| | | 86 |
|-----|--|----|
| 1 | Q. What what state was USAAG | |
| 2 | incorporated in, do you know? | |
| 3 | A. No, I don't. | |
| 4 | Q. Is there anybody is there anybody | |
| 5 | else associated with USAAG that you're aware | |
| 6 | of? | |
| 7 | A. Yeah, I talked to someone else, but | |
| 8 | (Inaudible). There's several people. | |
| 9 | They're slipping my mind right now. There | |
| L 0 | was Mike Lavinsky. | |
| 1 | Q. How how do you know this Mr. Mike | |
| _2 | Lavesky (Phonetic spelling)? | |
| _3 | A. You know what, several years ago, he | |
| 4 | had he had called. I don't know if you | |
| _5 | saw the number on the sideline or whatever. | |
| L 6 | He called and he came and he wanted to meet, | |
| _7 | and we came out and we looked at the | |
| 8_ | properties. And he's come back a couple | |
| _9 | times since. | |
| 20 | Q. Okay. Why have you never applied | |
| 21 | for an occupancy permit for U Lock on that | |
| 22 | site? | |
| 23 | A. I'm not sure. Like I said, Kash, my | |
| 24 | brother Kash handled most of that stuff. | |
| 25 | And then I think we were kind of | |
| | | |

| | | 87 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | grandfathered in with, you know, the storage | |
| 2 | facility, is kind of what the Township told | |
| 3 | us there, so | |
| 4 | Q. I can I can assure you that | |
| 5 | according to North Huntingdon Township, that | |
| 6 | you are not grandfathered in. | |
| 7 | A. (Inaudible). | |
| 8 | Q. Do you pay business privilege tax to | |
| 9 | North Huntingdon Township? | |
| 10 | A. Pardon me? | |
| 11 | Q. Do you pay business privilege tax to | |
| 12 | North Huntingdon Township? | |
| 13 | A. I don't think so, but | |
| 14 | Q. Any reason why not? | |
| 15 | A. No, just like we said before, we | |
| 16 | haven't paid anything. We didn't have the | |
| 17 | money, so we didn't pay any of the taxes | |
| 18 | yet. But we don't (Inaudible). We're going | |
| 19 | to file them. | |
| 20 | Q. Now, when you had the Kubota | |
| 21 | machinery, you you borrowed you | |
| 22 | entered into a loan agreement, U Lock | |
| 23 | entered into a loan agreement to purchase | |
| 24 | that equipment; is that correct? | |
| 25 | A. In 2016 you mean? | |
| | | |

| | | 88 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | Q. Yes. | |
| 2 | A. Yes. | |
| 3 | Q. Okay. And I assume that U Lock made | |
| 4 | payments to keep the loan current; is that | |
| 5 | correct? | |
| 6 | A. Yes. | |
| 7 | Q. Okay. And you then sold the Kubota | |
| 8 | property or equipment and received \$45,000 | |
| 9 | for it, so you must have paid at least | |
| 10 | \$45,000 from U Lock to Kubota; is that | |
| 11 | correct? | |
| 12 | A. Well, a lot of times if U Lock | |
| 13 | didn't make enough money sometimes to cover | |
| 14 | it, and I always I always put the money | |
| 15 | in to cover the payments, so I put quite a | |
| 16 | bit of money towards the payments. | |
| 17 | Q. Is it is it correct that you | |
| 18 | rented that equipment out periodically? | |
| 19 | A. I don't know that we ever I don't | |
| 20 | know that we ever rented it out. We put a | |
| 21 | sign there that, for rent, but we didn't | |
| 22 | rent that machine out. That stayed on the | |
| 23 | property. But we have another machine like | |
| 24 | that, so when someone would call and say, | |
| 25 | hey, can I rent an excavator, yeah, we did | |

do that a couple times, but only a handful of times.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. When you say we had another piece of equipment, who is the we you're talking about, U Lock?
- A. No, no, I'm sorry, no. Personally I had another piece of equipment that was almost identical to that, that one. And this is going back years. I mean, I think that was, if it was in like 2016 or something. We put that there and we (Inaudible) for rent, but what we rented was a machine that was almost identical to that one. But I don't -- I think -- I can't even remember the charge. We rented, I think it was rented to a friend just a couple times. But as far as I know, I don't think that particular machine owned by U Lock was rented out ever.
- Q. What is -- what is the involvement of Eric Martin in U Lock?
- A. None. He had -- I think he loaned -- he loaned the down money for U Lock in the beginning, but he was --
 - Q. And in fact, he was repaid by the --

| | | 90 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | by the at the closing, or he was repaid | |
| 2 | with money out of I believe Henry Moore's | |
| 3 | escrow. So what, what did you pay Mr. | |
| 4 | Martin; what did you pay Mr. Martin to loan | |
| 5 | you the down payment for this property? | |
| 6 | A. I don't I don't think anything. | |
| 7 | Q. So he he did it as a as a | |
| 8 | friendship? | |
| 9 | A. Yes. | |
| 10 | Q. Out of friendship? | |
| 11 | A. Yeah. | |
| 12 | Q. Okay. Let's see. Have you given a | |
| 13 | complete list of all of the renters on that | |
| 14 | property to the Trustee? | |
| 15 | A. At the time I gave him all, you | |
| 16 | know, when we filed the schedules, we gave | |
| 17 | I gave him everything I knew about. And | |
| 18 | as things came up, like, I believe the | |
| 19 | tractor-trailer we were talking about | |
| 20 | earlier was not on the schedule, but I | |
| 21 | updated him on that. If anything did come | |
| 22 | to light after the fact, we'd let him know. | |
| 23 | Q. Well, you've controlled you've | |
| 24 | controlled that property from 2015 up until | |
| 25 | at least when the bankruptcy petition was | |
| | | |

filed, so it would seem logical that you would have a list of tenants for all your -- all your lockers and there wouldn't be people who had stuff stored there that you wouldn't know about, even if you didn't know them personally, so --

A. Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. So are you telling us that there are tenants or renters that you don't know about?
- A. Well, there were -- I wasn't the one -- when you're saying I was in control of the property, I didn't do every task there at the property, nor was I in control of every aspect of it, so my brother kind of --
- Q. Well, U Lock was, and you're the president of U Lock, so it's your responsibility?
- A. Yeah, so like I said, Kash was the (Inaudible) with the tenants and myself.
- Q. Oh, so you're telling me Kash was in charge of all the renters and had a complete list of the tenants, of the renters?
- A. I don't know exactly what he has. I think you asked him that question before on

2.0

2.1

2.4

the stand. I can't remember what he answered, but I -- yeah, he did that way more than I did. I just, like I said, I've been trying to play catch-up here in the past few months and, you know, like I said, I didn't do every single task on that property. So, yeah, he would -- he would have more of a complete list than I have. But I think we're -- we're pretty, pretty much, I'd have to say 90, 98 percent or something, you know, accurate when we give Mr. Slone the statements, would be my guess. But like I said --

MR. OTTO: Mr. Slone, we've had a number of questions which in my view are fairly important that Mr. Snyder has said he can't answer because his brother Kash has the information.

MR. SLONE: Well, we can take -you can schedule a 2004 Examination of Kash
Snyder. Maybe that's what should be done.

MR. OTTO: I -- I was going to ask, I'm not sure what the mechanism would be, to do that or to continue the 341 meeting until Mr. Snyder, Mr. Kash Snyder is

93 1 available. 2 MR. SLONE: Well, I won't close 3 4 MR. OTTO: I'll leave that to 5 your discretion. 6 MR. SLONE: I won't close -- I 7 will not close the meeting today. So we can 8 reschedule a continuation of it when we get 9 a date for Mr. Kash, or you can take a 2004 10 Examination, either way. 11 MR. OTTO: Okay. Let me -- let 12 me talk to Sarah Wenrich separately and --13 and --14 MR. SLONE: Yeah, I will not 15 close this. MR. OTTO: Either I will --16 17 MR. SLONE: I will not close the 18 meeting today. The meeting will be held 19 open. 2.0 MR. OTTO: That's all the 21 questions I have for now, but --22 MR. SLONE: Okay. 23 MR. OTTO: -- I don't know if

MR. SLONE: Any other questions?

Sarah or Christine have any.

2.4

| | | 94 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | MS. BIROS: I have one, Bill. | |
| 2 | Bill I had one. | |
| 3 | MR. OTTO: Yes, go ahead. | |
| 4 | MS. BIROS: Is Biros on the | |
| 5 | checking account for U Lock? | |
| 6 | MR. OTTO: Mr. Snyder, did you | |
| 7 | hear that question? | |
| 8 | MR. GEORGE SNYDER: No, I'm | |
| 9 | sorry. | |
| 10 | MR. OTTO: Who, who has the | |
| 11 | who is authorized to sign, with Citizens | |
| 12 | Bank to sign checks for U Lock? | |
| 13 | MR. GEORGE SNYDER: Kash Snyder, | |
| 14 | my brother. | |
| 15 | MR. OTTO: Only Kash, not you? | |
| 16 | MR. GEORGE SNYDER: Not me; | |
| 17 | correct. | |
| 18 | MR. OTTO: Only Kash, okay. | |
| 19 | MR. GEORGE SNYDER: Yes. | |
| 20 | MR. OTTO: Sarah, do you have any | |
| 21 | questions? | |
| 22 | MS. WENRICH: I do not have any | |
| 23 | further questions at this time. Thank you. | |
| 24 | MR. SLONE: Okay, what I'm going | |
| 25 | to do, if there's no further questions, I | |

| | | 95 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | will keep the meeting open and then | |
| 2 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: I excuse | |
| 3 | me, this is Shanni. | |
| 4 | MR. SLONE: Yes. | |
| 5 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: I have | |
| 6 | questions. | |
| 7 | MR. SLONE: Okay, I'm giving | |
| 8 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: (Inaudible). | |
| 9 | MR. SLONE: Okay. Is it going to | |
| 10 | be lengthy or within the next ten minutes? | |
| 11 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: No. Yes, we | |
| 12 | should be good. | |
| 13 | MR. SLONE: Okay, go. | |
| 14 | EXAMINATION OF GEORGE SNYDER: | |
| 15 | BY MS. SHANNI SNYDER | |
| 16 | Q. Okay. George, you were the primary | |
| 17 | officer of U Lock; isn't that right? | |
| 18 | A. Yes. | |
| 19 | Q. Did you answer? | |
| 20 | A. Yes. | |
| 21 | MR. SLONE: He said yes. | |
| 22 | Q. Hello? | |
| 23 | A. Correct. | |
| 24 | Q. Okay. You were the primary | |
| 25 | shareholder of U Lock; isn't that right? | |

| | | 96 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | A. Yes, majority shareholder. | |
| 2 | Q. When you started U Lock, did it have | |
| 3 | any money? | |
| 4 | A. No. We were (Inaudible). | |
| 5 | Q. When you formed U Lock, did you | |
| 6 | discuss the name with Christine and John | |
| 7 | Biros? | |
| 8 | A. I didn't finish answering your other | |
| 9 | question when you said we didn't have any | |
| 10 | money. We were supposed to, was promised | |
| 11 | money by Biros to keep U Lock, you know, to, | |
| 12 | to develop U Lock, so, but when they didn't | |
| 13 | put up the money, then, no, we didn't have | |
| 14 | any. So I'm sorry, what's your next | |
| 15 | question? | |
| 16 | Q. Okay. When you when you formed U | |
| 17 | Lock, did you discuss the name with | |
| 18 | Christine and John Biros? | |
| 19 | A. Yes, we discussed everything | |
| 20 | together. We met almost daily, but at the | |
| 21 | very least weekly. | |
| 22 | Q. Okay, when did U Lock open its bank | |
| 23 | account? | |
| 24 | A. I'm not sure exactly. I think we | |
| 25 | purchased it in like 5/2015, something like | |
| | | |

| | | 97 |
|-----|---|----|
| 1 | that. It was sometime after that. | |
| 2 | MR. OTTO: I'm sorry, I didn't | |
| 3 | hear that date. | |
| 4 | Q. (Inaudible). | |
| 5 | A. I believe, I think just right after | |
| 6 | we we purchased it. So I think probably, | |
| 7 | if we bought it in July, I would say we had | |
| 8 | the bank account by September. That's | |
| 9 | Q. The whole idea of U Lock was to get | |
| L 0 | this property and develop it; isn't that | |
| 1 | right? | |
| _2 | A. Correct. | |
| 13 | Q. Christine Biros promised to put up | |
| 4 | the money to help you with that; isn't that | |
| _5 | right? | |
| L 6 | A. Yes. | |
| _7 | Q. Did you have silent partners from | |
| 8 . | 2015 to 2018? | |
| _9 | A. Yeah, Christine Biros and John | |
| 20 | Biros. | |
| 21 | Q. And how often did you have meetings | |
| 22 | with John and Christine Biros from 2015 | |
| 23 | through 2018 then? | |
| 24 | A. I would 2015 to '18? I would say | |
| 25 | with John, I would say almost every day. | |
| | | |

2.0

2.1

2.4

And then he was -- he relayed whatever
Christine would say to me. And then
Christine, and I wanted to clarify a
question I didn't get to finish answering
before. When I met Christine, it was every
Wednesday, and she would ask me to come down
to meet with her at her place of business,
which happened to be a bar or a tavern. And
I didn't drink; we don't drink. We didn't
sit at the bar. We'd sit in the office and
talk. And so it wasn't that just we just
ran into each other at some bar somewhere.
It was, she was the owner of this business.
We were meeting at her request there.

- Q. Did you discuss the U Lock and its plans at these meetings?
- A. Yes, we always, we sat there for hours. That's all we talked about.
- Q. And you're saying it was a bar. What was the name of the bar?
- A. Caesar's Tavern. Well, we didn't always meet at a bar. There -- we met different places, wherever they requested. You know, there were different places we met, but a lot of it was at that -- at her

99

place of business, Caesar's Tavern.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

- Q. Okay, so you discussed the U Lock and its plans with them at those meetings, and when did the meetings stop?
- A. I'm not really sure. As far as the -- as far as with Christine, it kind of stopped a little earlier, like maybe in 2018. John I talked to a little bit less, less, but I've met up with John just as recently as last year (Inaudible). Maybe even this year.
- Q. And did you have progress updates and meetings even after Christine Biros sued you?
- A. Yes. Yeah, we always did. Even I think at one point they even, you know, paused the lawsuit so we could talk about moving forward.
- Q. When you had these meetings during the lawsuit, was Ms. Biros' attorney, was Ms. Biros' attorney present with you?
 - A. No.
- Q. Did you consider Ms. Biros the control person of U Lock?
 - A. Yes.

| | | 100 |
|----|--|-----|
| 1 | MR. SLONE: At what point? | |
| 2 | Q. Even after the lawsuit, even after | |
| 3 | the lawsuit, did you feel that Ms. Biros was | |
| 4 | Ms. Biros was making the shots, calling | |
| 5 | the shots in U Lock, making the decisions? | |
| 6 | A. Yes. The whole time. | |
| 7 | Q. U Lock had a company car it used; is | |
| 8 | that correct? | |
| 9 | A. Yes, truck, pickup truck. | |
| 10 | Q. Who owned the company car? | |
| 11 | A. I believe it's the Biros family. | |
| 12 | I'm not exactly sure who it's titled to, but | |
| 13 | I'm I believe someone in the Biros | |
| 14 | family, Bob or John or I'm not sure. | |
| 15 | Q. When did U Lock return it? | |
| 16 | A. Just in recent years. We used it | |
| 17 | from, I believe, I think 2015 maybe from the | |
| 18 | beginning till I think '20, sometime in | |
| 19 | 2020. '21, '22. Yeah, so not the past two | |
| 20 | years. Somewhere in 2020 they (Inaudible) | |
| 21 | take it back. | |
| 22 | Q. Okay, so from 2015 to 2020 the | |
| 23 | company car belonged to the Biros family? | |
| 24 | A. Yes. | |
| 25 | Q. Can you hear me? | |
| | | |

| | | 101 |
|----|--|-----|
| 1 | A. Yeah, I can hear you. | |
| 2 | Q. (Inaudible). | |
| 3 | A. I'm sorry. Did I miss a question? | |
| 4 | Go ahead. | |
| 5 | Q. So from 2015 through the beginning | |
| 6 | of 2020, the company car belonged to the | |
| 7 | Biros family? | |
| 8 | A. Oh, yeah, I thought I answered that. | |
| 9 | Yes, yeah, we knew there was there | |
| 10 | was a truck that was used on the facility, | |
| 11 | and it belonged, to them and we used it | |
| 12 | quite a bit. And then when it would need | |
| 13 | any maintenance or anything, John would pick | |
| 14 | up the truck, take it to the to get | |
| 15 | inspected or whatever needed done, brakes | |
| 16 | done or something, and he would bring it | |
| 17 | back to the property. | |
| 18 | Q. And did the Biros family place | |
| 19 | trailers onto the property at U Lock? | |
| 20 | A. Yes, two (Inaudible) like maybe 70- | |
| 21 | foot mobile homes. | |
| 22 | Q. Did you ask them to do that? | |
| 23 | A. No. | |
| 24 | Q. So the whole time, even after the | |
| 25 | lawsuit, you considered Ms. Biros to be part | |
| | | |

| | | 102 |
|----|---|-----|
| 1 | of U Lock? | |
| 2 | A. Yeah. And I believe they put those | |
| 3 | trailers there after the lawsuit. They | |
| 4 | just, yeah, she was always in control. | |
| 5 | Q. And when Christine Biros sued U | |
| 6 | Lock, did she ask the Court to order | |
| 7 | repayment or payment to her for rent? | |
| 8 | A. Oh, you mean this most recent thing | |
| 9 | where they're asking for me, George Snyder, | |
| 10 | to pay U Lock rent? Or U Lock to pay her | |
| 11 | rent? | |
| 12 | Q. No, I said when Christine Biros sued | |
| 13 | U Lock, did she ask the Court to order | |
| 14 | payment to her for rent? | |
| 15 | A. No. She never mentioned that. | |
| 16 | Q. Did Christine Biros ever send you a | |
| 17 | bill for rent? | |
| 18 | A. No, she did not. | |
| 19 | Q. Did Christine Biros ever ask you to | |
| 20 | pay her rent? | |
| 21 | A. No, there was no mention of | |
| 22 | (Inaudible). | |
| 23 | Q. When U Lock purchased | |
| 24 | A. The other court (Inaudible). | |
| 25 | Q. When U Lock purchased the property, | |
| | | |

| | | 103 |
|----|---|-----|
| 1 | did it have tires on it? | |
| 2 | A. Yes, there were a lot of tires | |
| 3 | there. | |
| 4 | Q. What did U Lock do to improve this | |
| 5 | property from 2015 to 2020? | |
| 6 | A. I apologize, can you repeat that | |
| 7 | question? | |
| 8 | Q. What did U Lock do to improve the | |
| 9 | property from 2015 to 2020? | |
| 10 | A. No. | |
| 11 | MR. SLONE: Where are we where | |
| 12 | are we going with this? Just give me a | |
| 13 | heads-up. | |
| 14 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: I only I | |
| 15 | only have I only have a few more | |
| 16 | questions, but I'm trying to determine | |
| 17 | whether Christine Biros and the Biros | |
| 18 | insurance trust are co-debtors or insiders | |
| 19 | of U Lock. | |
| 20 | MR. SLONE: Okay, you can ask a | |
| 21 | few more questions. | |
| 22 | MS. BIROS: I think that's | |
| 23 | already been determined, so | |
| 24 | A. I'll answer pretty quickly. We did | |
| 25 | everything there, from changing light bulbs | |
| | | |

104 to electrical service to guide wires, over a 1 2 couple hundred tons of substrate for the 3 parking lot. We fixed garage doors. We had 4 garage door openers installed. We met with 5 tenants. Developed roads to go down below, 6 a road going up to the highway. We did --7 we did all, you know, all kind of stuff. 8 removed a lot of the garbage from there, 9 cleaned up tires, recycled things. 10 There was dozens and dozens of TV's and 11 different things there. So the list is 12 quite extensive, but I'll keep it brief 13 since we want to move on here. So, but, yeah, anything that was entailed down there, 14 15 we did the work. I did a lot of work 16 personally. 17 Okay, I only have a few more 18 questions. U Lock had me watching its 19 Dropcamera; isn't that correct? 2.0 Α. Yes. 2.1 U Lock never paid me anything; isn't 22 that correct? 23 Α. That's correct. 2.4 Did Christine Biros know I was Ο. 25 helping?

| | | 105 |
|-----|--|-----|
| 1 | A. Yes, she knew every step of the way, | |
| 2 | every | |
| 3 | Q. Did you tell her during your weekly | |
| 4 | meetings? | |
| 5 | A. Yes. I went over everything. | |
| 6 | Q. And you considered my work to be a | |
| 7 | favor; isn't that right? | |
| 8 | A. Yes, at the time. | |
| 9 | Q. You called it sisterly love; isn't | |
| L O | that right? | |
| 1 | A. Oh, something like that. I think | |
| 12 | Kash used those words. | |
| 13 | Q. And Christine Biros didn't object to | |
| 4 | me doing this work, did she? When I sued | |
| L 5 | you, someone handed you the summons; isn't | |
| L 6 | that right? | |
| L 7 | A. That's correct. | |
| 8_ | Q. You knew about the lawsuit, but you | |
| L 9 | didn't answer it; right? | |
| 20 | A. Yes. | |
| 21 | Q. Did I discuss the lawsuit with you? | |
| 22 | A. No. | |
| 23 | Q. Did I ask you not to hire an | |
| 24 | attorney? | |
| 25 | MR. OTTO: I'm sorry, I didn't | |

| | 106 |
|----|---|
| 1 | hear the answer. I'm sorry, what? |
| 2 | A. I'm sorry. |
| 3 | Q. Did I discuss the lawsuit |
| 4 | MR. OTTO: What was the answer to |
| 5 | your first question? Did you discuss the |
| 6 | lawsuit |
| 7 | A. No, I did not. |
| 8 | MR. OTTO: with Ms. Snyder? |
| 9 | A. I did not discuss the lawsuit. I |
| 10 | did not discuss the lawsuit with her. |
| 11 | MR. OTTO: Okay. |
| 12 | Q. Did I ask you not to hire an |
| 13 | attorney? |
| 14 | A. No. |
| 15 | Q. Did I tell you to default? |
| 16 | A. No. |
| 17 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: That's all my |
| 18 | questions. |
| 19 | MR. SLONE: Okay, thank you. |
| 20 | Okay. |
| 21 | MS. SHANNI SNYDER: You're |
| 22 | welcome. |
| 23 | MR. SLONE: I will hold the |
| 24 | meeting open for the possible questions for |
| 25 | Kash Snyder, or if you want to schedule a |
| | |

| | 107 |
|----|--|
| 1 | 2004 Examination, let me know. And let me |
| 2 | know when Mr. Snyder, Kash Snyder would be |
| 3 | available, and then we'll get something |
| 4 | scheduled. Any other questions? |
| 5 | MR. GEORGE SNYDER: Okay, Mr |
| 6 | and also, Mr. Slone, if there's some of |
| 7 | those things, I could probably get some |
| 8 | answers for some things either maybe by |
| 9 | phone with Kash or I could, you know, look, |
| 10 | look for some answers for some of the things |
| 11 | (Inaudible) might be might have been |
| 12 | omitted today. |
| 13 | MR. SLONE: Well, get, all the |
| 14 | things that have been asked for, get that |
| 15 | information either filed or sent to me and |
| 16 | then, then we'll see what we're going to do |
| 17 | with when we're going to schedule Kash |
| 18 | Snyder. |
| 19 | MR. GEORGE SNYDER: Okay, sounds |
| 20 | |
| 21 | MR. SLONE: Okay. |
| 22 | MS. BIROS: Mr. Slone, Christine |
| 23 | Biros here. I have a question. |
| 24 | MR. SLONE: Yes. |
| 25 | MS. BIROS: I just want I just |
| | |

| | 108 |
|----|--|
| 1 | want it on the record that most of this that |
| 2 | I just heard is not correct and I knew |
| 3 | nothing about (Inaudible). |
| 4 | MR. SLONE: Okay, well, we're |
| 5 | this is only to ask questions of the |
| 6 | representative of U Lock. |
| 7 | MS. BIROS: Okay. |
| 8 | MR. SLONE: We're not we're |
| 9 | not trying the case here. |
| 10 | MS. BIROS: Okay. |
| 11 | MR. SLONE: But your comments are |
| 12 | received. So we're I'm going to I'm |
| 13 | going to close the I'm going to stop the |
| 14 | recording now and we'll reschedule later. |
| 15 | Thank you. (End of recording.) |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | |

| | 109 |
|----|--|
| 1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | CERTIFICATE |
| 4 | |
| 5 | I, Mary J. Carney, a Court Reporter and Notary |
| 6 | Public in and for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, |
| 7 | do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and |
| 8 | correct transcription of the recorded proceedings of |
| 9 | the 341(a) Meeting and constitutes a true record. |
| 10 | |
| 11 | This 27th day of January, 2023. |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | Notary Public |
| 15 | NOCATY FUDITE |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | |

| Page | 110 |
|----------|-----|
| _ 0. 9 0 | |

| | 1 | 1 | ı | 1 |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| A | 11:6,8,9,22,25 | appealed 81:20 | available 60:16 | 100:18 101:5 |
| ABC 61:7 | 12:1,8,10 19:13 | appear 24:14 | 73:24 79:23 | begs 67:18 |
| able 55:3 76:2 | 35:13 68:4,4,5 | 51:11 | 80:4 93:1 107:3 | behalf 5:3,5 26:4 |
| absolutely 48:15 | 68:21 | applied 86:20 | aware 21:25 | 66:8 |
| accepted 56:12 | Allen's 46:10 | approval 62:12 | 39:21 62:6 | believe 20:22 |
| access 72:16 73:7 | 68:11 | approximately | 82:17 86:5 | 39:13 42:4 50:8 |
| 76:1,1 80:20 | allowed 48:19,21 | 9:18 19:19 | | 51:1,3 52:15 |
| 81:5 84:6 | 84:5 | area 63:2 | B | 53:20 55:16,20 |
| accessible 80:23 | allows 80:24 | arguing 48:9 | back 7:4 11:12,14 | 56:22 57:17 |
| account 76:9 94:5 | amend 25:5 | arm's 48:9,17 | 11:16,21 12:2,8 | 58:23 69:24 |
| 96:23 97:8 | amended 14:23 | 49:15 | 12:12 13:24 | 70:1 78:8,10,25 |
| accountant 17:1 | 15:2 | arrangement | 18:10,14 19:17 | 78:25 79:10 |
| 17:25 | amount 29:14 | 27:19 | 19:18 22:9 | 80:9,13,19 |
| accounts 70:7 | 64:6 67:22 | arrangements | 28:20 36:4,9,17 | 84:21 90:2,18 |
| Accredited 13:10 | Andy 72:14 83:14 | 54:7 57:19 | 39:25 53:2 | 97:5 100:11,13 |
| 13:14,21 | answer 39:6 | asked 18:14,15 | 55:10 63:7 | 100:17 102:2 |
| accumulation | 43:10,12 44:16 | 42:16 46:3 52:2 | 68:21,23 69:6 | belonged 52:20 |
| 38:3 | 44:24 46:8,15 | 62:15,18,19 | 69:15 74:22,24 | 52:23 53:10 |
| accurate 92:11 | 46:20 59:8 | 65:23,24 66:14 | 75:4,18 83:8,23 | 100:23 101:6,11 |
| accurately 6:4 | 63:11,16 66:25 | 66:22,23 91:25 | 86:18 89:9 | best 39:13 |
| acres 8:3 | 67:2,8 76:11 | 107:14 | 100:21 101:17 | better 63:16 |
| action 7:17 33:15 | 77:15,25 92:17 | asking 18:16 | background | 81:22 |
| 43:20 44:5,6 | 95:19 103:24 | 36:22 42:19,20 | 35:10 | big 53:4,5 |
| 71:7 | 105:19 106:1,4 | 42:23 46:2,10 | backhoes 83:18 | bill 10:7,11 78:10 |
| actions 75:17 | answered 40:1 | 60:11 77:14 | backup 12:10 | 94:1,2 102:17 |
| administrative | 57:14 67:17 | 102:9 | bad 83:2 | billed 44:12 |
| 37:18 | 70:8 92:2 101:8 | aspect 91:15 | bank 17:21,25 | Biros 2:7 5:4,5,8 |
| advertising 31:20 | answering 42:15 | assert 48:6 | 94:12 96:22 | 7:10 8:5 13:24 |
| aerial 52:16,18 | 96:8 98:4 | asserting 34:4 | 97:8 | 14:7,19 17:11 |
| 53:11 | answers 107:8,10 | assertion 34:8 | bankruptcy 1:1,2 | 17:11 30:17 |
| afternoon 35:23 | anticipate 18:3 | assets 6:5,17 9:5 | 8:17,21,24 9:16 | 32:8 38:7,19,23 |
| ago 51:4 62:20 | 19:22 | 9:14 37:14 | 14:4,9 15:4 | 42:5 43:20 |
| 85:14 86:13 | anybody 9:19 | assigned 51:8 | 16:8 17:22 | 48:17 49:10,17 |
| agree 23:12 85:10 | 47:20 68:2 | associated 86:5 | 20:17 34:19 | 49:18,18,22 |
| agreed 60:19 | 69:18,25 71:19 | assume 83:24 | 39:1,23 44:13 | 54:24 55:12 |
| agreement 21:5 | 72:8,9 83:12 | 88:3 | 44:25 46:1 47:4 | 58:21 70:2 |
| 21:18 30:21 | 86:4,4 | assure 62:17 87:4 | 71:6,14 90:25 | 72:13 74:10 |
| 31:8 33:17 | anyway 43:25 | attempting 71:2 | bar 31:2,10 32:15 | 75:16 78:18 |
| 55:23 56:11 | anyways 62:11 | attention 6:12 | 98:8,10,12,19 | 83:4,13,14,14 |
| 85:14 87:22,23 | apiece 51:17 | attorney 4:6 | 98:20,22 | 83:14,15 84:8 |
| ahead 68:25 | apologies 5:7 | 17:16 20:16 | basis 64:11 | 94:1,4,4 96:7,11 |
| 71:13 94:3 | apologize 29:1 | 21:23 40:11 | bees 83:15 | 96:18 97:13,19 |
| 101:4 | 103:6 | 45:8 99:20,21 | beginning 31:18 | 97:20,22 99:13 |
| alleged 26:6 | apparently 56:1 | 105:24 106:13 | 31:23 73:21 | 99:23 100:3,4 |
| Allen 2:9 4:5 10:2 | 56:9,10 72:5 | authorized 94:11 | 74:23 89:24 | 100:11,13,23 |
| | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |
| · | | | · | · |

| | | | | Page III |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 101:7,18,25 | building 25:16 | 44:3 45:6 47:6 | 97:13,19,22 | 103:18 |
| 101.7,18,23 | © . | 47:24 48:9,16 | 98:2,3,5 99:6,13 | code 38:7 |
| | 42:12,22,24 82:20 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 1 1 1 | code 38:7 |
| 103:17,17,22 104:24 105:13 | | 58:22 75:15 | 102:5,12,16,19 | |
| | bulbs 103:25 | 76:10,23 108:9 | 103:17 104:24 | 71:15 74:3 |
| 107:22,23,25 | business 6:16,20 | cases 22:9 35:24 | 105:13 107:22 | collected 7:15 |
| 108:7,10 | 7:1 13:11,14 | cash 56:12 | circuit 79:21 80:4 | 56:2 58:2 |
| Biros' 99:20,21 | 43:25 58:16 | catch-up 70:15 | circumstances | come 22:9,25 |
| bit 39:18 45:4 | 87:8,11 98:7,13 | 92:4 | 48:8 | 46:24 55:2 63:7 |
| 88:16 99:8 | 99:1 | cause 7:16 11:12 | citation 39:20,24 | 73:17 83:4 |
| 101:12 | | 12:21 15:23 | 40:4,8 | 86:18 90:21 |
| blank 11:13 | <u>C</u> | 18:3 27:14 | cited 38:1,16,17 | 98:6 |
| blocked 83:6 | C 109:3,3 | 41:20 45:21 | 38:24,24 | coming 14:25 |
| blocking 72:16 | C-A-R-L 20:2 | 50:12 54:24 | Citizens 94:11 | 71:20 |
| board 46:13 | cable 78:11,12 | 57:4,12 70:15 | claim 7:16 8:6 | comment 38:25 |
| Bob 11:4 32:8 | 79:9 | 72:13 76:17 | 22:25 26:6 | comments 108:11 |
| 44:19 49:18 | Caesar's 31:2 | 80:8 | 32:23 35:1 44:3 | Commissioner |
| 72:13 83:13 | 98:21 99:1 | cell 11:2,16 12:6 | 46:7 63:9 67:20 | 42:6,17 |
| 100:14 | call 4:1 11:1,2,3 | 82:3 | 81:18 | Commonwealth |
| bona 47:23 | 11:12,14,16 | cellular 82:4 | claimed 31:17 | 109:6 |
| bonuses 76:25 | 12:2 32:16 36:3 | certainly 32:13 | 56:8 | communicated |
| books 26:14 | 36:9 41:21 | 40:17 56:7 | claiming 23:18 | 61:9 |
| 75:24 76:9 | 56:23 68:9,10 | certificates 30:24 | 23:21,22 53:6 | communications |
| borrowed 87:21 | 88:24 | certify 109:7 | 54:16 | 72:22 |
| bother 47:9,14 | called 13:10,13 | changed 23:5 | claims 9:15 47:18 | company 6:6,16 |
| bottom 77:17 | 57:18 81:12 | 25:6 | 64:9 65:21 81:4 | 7:2,12,23 9:25 |
| bought 97:7 | 86:14,16 105:9 | changes 52:4 | clarify 24:4 40:17 | 12:16 13:10,13 |
| box 51:1 | calling 11:5,20 | | 45:25 57:7,12 | 14:4,11 15:3,7 |
| | 100:4 | changing 103:25 | 98:3 | |
| brakes 101:15 | camera 65:5 | Chapter 1:3 | | 16:25 17:3,6 |
| brand 82:17 | 78:13 79:19 | charge 23:3 | clean 40:5 | 19:20 20:22,23 |
| brief 24:25 | 80:3,14,17 81:6 | 89:15 91:22 | cleaned 25:13,15 | 22:25 23:15 |
| 104:12 | 81:9,15,18,21 | charging 46:11 | 39:14,15 104:9 | 24:5,8,11 29:3,4 |
| bring 6:12 101:16 | 82:2 | check 9:10 33:11 | clear 66:1 | 29:12 31:9 34:5 |
| broken 84:11 | | 33:12 58:9 | clearly 57:15 | 48:22 69:19 |
| brother 13:1 | cameras 78:16,17 | checking 94:5 | 84:16 | 74:9 100:7,10 |
| 16:15 31:3 | 78:21,24 79:1,8 | checks 94:12 | client 32:12 78:22 | 100:23 101:6 |
| 47:15 48:11 | 80:12 81:5 | child 49:11,13,13 | close 24:21 33:2 | company's 28:6 |
| 59:4,6,21 65:2 | car 82:10,17,22 | Christine 2:7 5:3 | 49:16,17,17 | 53:20 |
| 65:24 66:15 | 82:23,23 83:7,9 | 7:10 17:11 23:2 | 93:2,6,7,15,17 | compensation |
| 70:1,3,15,16 | 84:15,24 100:7 | 23:3 30:17 31:4 | 108:13 | 23:9,25 24:15 |
| 73:19,22 82:22 | 100:10,23 101:6 | 31:22 32:7,15 | closed 79:21 | 25:19,24 26:12 |
| 86:24 91:15 | Carney 109:5 | 38:7,23 42:5 | closed-80:3 | 27:8 28:12 |
| 92:17 94:14 | cars 84:18 | 48:17 71:17,23 | closed-circuit | 76:25 77:21 |
| brother's 84:15 | case 4:2,3 6:18 | 72:14 74:4,10 | 80:7 81:6 | complain 73:5 |
| brought 7:6,7 | 8:14 20:24 | 74:16 83:13 | closing 90:1 | complete 90:13 |
| 12:21 53:17 | 36:18 38:20 | 93:24 96:6,18 | co-debtors | 91:22 92:8 |
| | | , | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | rage 112 |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| completely 61:15 | 79:18,21 80:7 | 39:1 41:4 43:19 | 76:23 | 98:23,24 104:11 |
| concede 64:5 | 91:12,14 99:24 | 44:5 45:12,16 | debtor's 76:9 | difficult 72:13 |
| concerned 18:4 | 102:4 | 48:25 51:16 | debtors 14:14 | 83:11 84:25 |
| confirm 37:2 | controlled 24:11 | 65:2,24 66:7 | December 20:10 | direct 54:19 |
| confused 57:13 | | 67:19 71:20 | 37:3 | |
| | 90:23,24 | | | directing 31:9 |
| conjunction 51:9 | controlling 14:16 | 74:20 75:9,11 | deciding 48:11 | direction 17:13 |
| connection 65:25 | 25:7 | 81:19 83:23 | decisions 100:5 | 25:10 |
| consent 79:17 | convert 60:18,20 | 102:6,13,24 | deeds 50:1 | directors 14:15 |
| consider 21:3,11 | 62:10 | 109:5 | default 20:22 | disagree 84:25 |
| 21:15 27:17 | copies 15:20 | cover 32:25 88:13 | 27:24 48:22,23 | disagreeing 26:1 |
| 28:4,10 40:4 | copy 5:21 29:8 | 88:15 | 49:4 75:9 | disappeared 11:7 |
| 47:25 48:1,5 | Corp 13:11,14 | covered 33:5 | 106:15 | 11:10 |
| 64:23 99:23 | corporate 33:14 | 83:10 | defend 20:24 | disbursed 20:13 |
| considered | 60:23 | covers 65:22 | 21:12,22 45:7 | discharged 74:1 |
| 101:25 105:6 | corporation | crazy 75:7 | 47:10 63:13 | disclose 40:2 |
| Consolidators | 12:20 21:24 | creditor 45:22,23 | 66:8 67:19 | 58:22 |
| 13:11,14 | 72:4 | creditors 1:13 | defense 47:12,23 | disclosure 41:1 |
| constitutes 109:9 | correct 8:7,10,12 | 4:24 11:5 13:22 | 48:6 | disconnected |
| constructive 25:9 | 30:6 37:4,10,13 | 22:4 | defenses 9:15,16 | 10:16 68:14 |
| contact 54:6,20 | 51:5 59:2,17,20 | credits 77:1 | 21:1 47:11 | 69:2 |
| 54:22 85:23 | 61:7,8,15 62:5 | current 48:1 88:4 | denied 31:22 | discovery 65:7 |
| contacted 41:10 | 63:4 69:8,16,17 | currently 13:25 | denies 32:12 | 67:12 |
| 70:21 | 71:1 77:3,11,15 | 39:24 59:19 | department 41:5 | discretion 93:5 |
| contained 6:2 | 78:1 79:25 80:1 | 82:9 | 41:10,15,16,21 | discuss 40:10 |
| containers 50:2,5 | 80:15 87:24 | customers 25:14 | 42:2,13,25 | 96:6,17 98:15 |
| 50:10,16,19,25 | 88:5,11,17 | cut 25:15 | deposition 32:6,7 | 105:21 106:3,5 |
| 51:11,17,24,24 | 94:17 95:23 | | describe 25:1 | 106:9,10 |
| 52:7,17 85:6,13 | 97:12 100:8 | D | destroying 72:15 | discussed 40:12 |
| contention 83:4 | 104:19,22,23 | daily 96:20 | details 32:10 | 70:18 96:19 |
| contest 8:11,18 | 105:17 108:2 | damage 73:1 | 81:17 | 99:2 |
| contested 8:21 | 109:8 | damaged 54:25 | determination | District 1:1 27:25 |
| continuation | correctly 66:14 | 55:12 | 38:19 | 81:19 |
| 12:13 36:19,24 | counsel 65:9 | damaging 83:19 | determine 103:16 | dividends 61:25 |
| 69:3 93:8 | 75:20 | date 29:19,19 | determined | 62:1,1 78:5 |
| continue 9:12 | county 48:14 | 37:2 39:9 93:9 | 103:23 | docket 75:19 |
| 47:6 75:17 | county 48.14 couple 22:22 | 97:3 | develop 96:12 | document 37:24 |
| 92:24 | 28:12 37:25 | day 31:6 42:3 | 97:10 | 65:10 77:9 |
| | | 43:9 54:23 68:7 | | |
| continuous 64:11 | 42:14 50:3,4 | 97:25 109:11 | developed 25:14 | documentation |
| continuously | 54:9 56:5 57:21 | days 19:23 42:14 | 64:25 104:5 | 31:13 |
| 65:21 | 66:13 70:19 | 54:9 57:21 68:7 | dialing 11:3,23 | documents 6:4,9 |
| contractors 15:24 | 85:2 86:18 89:1 | dealing 85:20 | 68:12 | doing 21:5 65:4 |
| 22:19 26:16 | 89:16 104:2 | dealt 57:16 73:19 | different 15:11 | 105:14 |
| 64:6 | course 6:16 | debtor 1:8 14:18 | 24:6,7 26:3 | Doll 58:5 |
| control 14:16,17 | court 1:1 20:21 | | 28:14 61:16,18 | dollars 26:24 |
| 23:15,20 30:18 | 27:25 32:12 | 37:21 40:22 | 61:24 73:5 | 27:11 28:13 |
| | ı | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| | | | | rage 113 |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 55:2 | 47:17 63:3,8,15 | example 72:11 | fees 28:8 44:4 | forward 99:18 |
| door 104:4 | 63:19,23 64:1 | example 72.11 excavator 88:25 | fide 47:23 | four 6:18 15:21 |
| doors 104:4 doors 104:3 | 64:13,14 65:11 | excuse 4:9 32:20 | | |
| | / | | fight 28:7 | 16:5 18:11,13 |
| doubled 66:7 | 65:12 67:13,14 | 32:20 38:15 | figured 49:1 | 27:12 63:2 80:5 |
| dozen 15:10 | employment | 84:12 95:2 | file 14:22 15:1 | four-year 63:9 |
| 22:21 41:17 | 47:20 48:10 | exercised 77:2 | 17:3,6,14 18:2 | 64:11 81:3 |
| dozens 104:10,10 | enabled 75:6 | EXHIBITS 3:12 | 24:25 26:5 | fraudulent 28:1 |
| dozers 73:8 83:17 | enforcement 38:7 | existence 31:22 | 40:15 48:12 | free 46:13,25 |
| drag 22:7 | entailed 104:14 | expect 7:2,12 | 87:19 | friend 89:16 |
| draws 76:25 | entered 55:22 | experience 72:9 | filed 8:16,16,17 | friendship 90:8 |
| drink 33:21 98:9 | 56:11 87:22,23 | explain 23:17 | 15:4 17:22 | 90:10 |
| 98:9 | entitled 27:6 66:5 | 50:10 | 20:21 33:15 | front 28:22 33:3 |
| drive 82:12 | environmental | explained 63:20 | 39:2 40:24 44:2 | 82:19 85:25 |
| driving 41:13 | 37:17 39:16 | explanation | 44:3 45:6 76:10 | fulfill 30:11 |
| 65:5 | equipment 37:3 | 76:12 | 90:16 91:1 | further 40:21 |
| Dropcam 81:12 | 53:4,6 87:24 | extended 64:10 | 107:15 | 45:4 94:23,25 |
| Dropcamera | 88:8,18 89:4,7 | extensive 104:12 | filing 6:18 8:13 | |
| 104:19 | Eric 89:21 | | 12:25 67:6 | G |
| | errors 6:11 | F | 76:22 | game 25:20 |
| E | escrow 90:3 | F 109:3 | fill 59:4 | garage 104:3,4 |
| E 109:3,3 | Esquire 2:3,5,6,9 | face 73:16 79:2 | final 38:18 | garbage 38:4 |
| earlier 22:17 45:5 | | facility 59:22 | find 28:23 45:21 | 39:14,18 40:5 |
| 47:7 90:20 99:7 | estate 7:24,24 | 73:25 76:4 | | 83:21 104:8 |
| easy 47:11 | 48:13 51:8,9,11 | 84:21 87:2 | 77:16 | garbled 61:21 |
| effort 17:23 70:24 | estates 50:1 52:25 | 101:10 | fine 36:6 39:21 | gather 62:22 |
| either 24:9 30:17 | estimate 16:19 | fact 31:19 41:4 | 40:8 | gather 62:22 gathering 17:25 |
| | event 42:2,7,13 | | finish 42:15 | |
| 42:1 56:12 | 43:1 | 41:10 53:14 | 84:12 96:8 98:4 | general 14:15 |
| 75:16 93:10,16 | everybody 9:11 | 55:8 61:12 66:4 | fire 41:5,10,12,14 | 17:16 |
| 107:8,15 | 10:4 72:15 | 89:25 90:22 | 41:15,21 42:2 | George 2:4 3:5 |
| elaborate 12:20 | 83:16 | fairly 92:16 | 42:13,25 | 4:9,10,22 5:16 |
| electric 78:8 | evidence 30:19 | familiar 6:1 | firms 76:8 | 10:2 11:6 12:13 |
| electrical 25:17 | 31:7,16,17 32:5 | family 54:24 | first 22:16 37:1 | 13:4 22:14 |
| 104:1 | 47:16 62:20 | 72:14 83:13 | 38:1 51:16 52:1 | 29:24 36:24 |
| else's 35:12 79:12 | 83:24 | 100:11,14,23 | 62:15 106:5 | 50:21 51:12 |
| 79:16 | exact 29:14 33:3 | 101:7,18 | five 26:24 27:11 | 57:1 61:1 65:10 |
| employee 21:4,12 | 78:20 | far 18:16 19:17 | fixed 25:17 104:3 | 68:5,22 69:1,3 |
| 21:17 24:17 | exactly 91:24 | 30:20,20 31:8 | flip- 59:10 | 94:8,13,16,19 |
| 26:6 27:18 28:5 | 96:24 100:12 | 44:13 52:11 | flopped 59:11 | 95:14,16 102:9 |
| 28:10 47:13 | Examination 3:6 | 89:17 99:5,6 | follow 21:9 77:7 | 107:5,19 |
| 48:1,6 64:23 | 3:7,8,9 5:16 | fashion 66:3 | foot 101:21 | getting 19:22 |
| 66:2,5,11 | 12:13 22:14 | father 32:8 | footage 55:13 | 46:14 67:15 |
| employees 15:3,7 | | favor 64:24 105:7 | | 72:17 |
| 15:16 16:1 | 29:24 36:24 | Federal 20:20 | foreclosing 75:5 | girl 56:19 57:8 |
| 22:18 24:13,19 | 69:3 92:20 | 66:7 | foregoing 109:7 | give 4:20 6:17 |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 93:10 95:14 | feel 83:2 100:3 | form 76:24 | 15:20 22:10 |
| 26:5,13,14,17 | 107:1 | 100.3 | formed 96:5,16 | 13.20 22:10 |
| | I | I | I . | I |

| | | | | Tage 114 |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| 28:20,21 29:2 | ground 21:21 | helped 28:11 | 21:16 25:20,24 | inform 33:18 |
| 38:14 74:18 | guess 16:20 28:17 | 66:22 | 27:22 29:2,10 | information 6:2 |
| 79:16 92:11 | 30:8 32:2 63:11 | helpful 29:7 | 30:9 32:5,19,22 | 19:10 20:11 |
| 103:12 | 92:12 | helping 15:9,10 | 33:23 34:24 | 29:5,18 79:7 |
| given 47:15 90:12 | guessing 84:20 | 22:21 27:19 | 35:3,5 40:17,19 | 85:23 92:18 |
| giving 95:7 | guide 104:1 | 66:18 104:25 | 42:9,18,22 47:3 | 107:15 |
| Glenn 53:6 | guide 104.1 guy 53:7 58:17 | Henry 90:2 | 48:4,20 49:5,7,8 | informational |
| GLT 36:19 | guys 10:2 11:9 | hey 88:25 | 49:23 51:14 | 5:21 |
| go 18:10 21:8 | 41:11 | hi 5:2 11:4,8 | 52:5 53:15 | informed 62:4,21 |
| U | 41.11 | 73:18 | | initial 41:12 |
| 35:22,23 39:25 | H | | 54:13 55:4,13 | |
| 41:25 42:11 | H 2:3 | high-resolution | 55:23,25 56:22 | initiated 38:23 |
| 43:2 45:4,11 | half 15:10 22:21 | 81:25 | 57:22 59:14 | insider 76:23 |
| 47:9,21 48:25 | hand 4:19 | highway 41:13 | 60:22 62:25 | insiders 103:18 |
| 49:1,3 68:25 | handed 105:15 | 104:6 | 65:6,13,16,19 | inspected 101:15 |
| 71:13 74:6 | handful 89:1 | hire 105:23 | 66:9,20 67:3,17 | installed 104:4 |
| 75:18 79:22 | | 106:12 | 71:5 72:1,20 | instigated 39:4 |
| 94:3 95:13 | handled 86:24 | hold 12:4 43:22 | 73:10 74:7 | institution 76:17 |
| 101:4 104:5 | hang 9:7 68:17 | 60:2 68:17 77:8 | 75:21 76:6,13 | insurance 85:16 |
| goes 44:13 52:11 | 68:20 | 106:23 | 77:24 78:19 | 85:17 103:18 |
| going 4:24 12:19 | happen 80:24 | holding 17:18 | 79:4,6,14 80:21 | interest 74:25 |
| 13:23 18:2 21:9 | happened 10:13 | homes 101:21 | 81:2,16 82:7 | interference 84:8 |
| 22:3,7,7 32:9 | 11:13 32:15 | Honda 82:14,15 | 83:21 84:3,10 | interim 4:5 |
| 35:21,22 38:13 | 42:20,21 98:8 | 82:15 | 84:14 85:4 86:8 | interruption |
| 38:14 44:7,14 | harassing 83:16 | hopefully 57:16 | 87:7,18 89:12 | 30:14 |
| 45:16 53:2 55:5 | hard 82:12 | hours 15:13 | 91:20 95:8 96:4 | INTRODUCED |
| 56:25 57:2,4,5 | hazardous 37:23 | 22:22 98:18 | 97:4 99:10 | 3:12 |
| 71:24 72:18,19 | 39:17 40:23 | hundred 26:24 | 100:20 101:2,20 | involuntary 8:8 |
| 72:24 74:1,18 | 43:12 | 27:11 28:13 | 102:22,24 | 8:17,24 |
| 87:18 89:9 | he'll 46:12 | 104:2 | 107:11 108:3 | involved 37:16,18 |
| 92:22 94:24 | heads-up 103:13 | Huntingdon 38:2 | inception 14:20 | 54:11 74:16,16 |
| 95:9 103:12 | hear 65:18 68:23 | 38:8,25 41:25 | 17:18 | 75:18 |
| 104:6 107:16,17 | 68:24 71:8 94:7 | 42:11 87:5,9,12 | including 76:24 | involvement 67:5 |
| 108:12,13,13 | 97:3 100:25 | | incorporated | 67:7 89:20 |
| good 36:12 68:23 | 101:1 106:1 | 1 | 9:17,18,25 | irrelevant 34:18 |
| 95:12 | heard 22:20 | idea 10:20 11:12 | 12:16 86:2 | 43:24 |
| governmental | 35:25 81:19 | 47:3 97:9 | incorrect 34:8 | IRS 64:19 |
| 37:20,22 40:22 | 108:2 | identical 89:8,13 | 35:2 43:13 | issue 32:11 39:16 |
| 41:3 43:11 | hearing 51:16 | immediately | 51:13 66:21 | 62:1 |
| grandfathered | 52:1 | 55:11 58:9 | independent 64:5 | issued 13:16,16 |
| 87:1,6 | heavy 53:4,6 | important 92:16 | INDEX 3:1 | 15:16 30:23 |
| grass 25:15 | held 33:16 93:18 | improve 103:4,8 | indicted 17:15 | 39:5 |
| great 5:9 12:9 | hello 9:19 10:3 | inaccessible 55:1 | indictment 32:4 | issues 24:7 |
| 20:14 72:11 | 11:22 68:2,18 | Inaudible 8:19,25 | individual 28:21 | items 51:8 |
| greater 34:2 | 95:22 | 9:3 11:13 16:19 | 32:14 56:16 | |
| gross 16:9 | help 26:25 97:14 | 16:24 19:22 | individuals 76:8 | J |
| 0 | | | | |
| • | | | | |

| | | | | Page 113 |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| TO 0 100 5 | 02 2 00 4 05 1 | 00 17 00 16 22 | | 52 0 12 50 22 |
| J 2:9 109:5 | 83:3 88:4 95:1 | 89:17 90:16,22 | liability 61:14 | 52:9,12 58:22 |
| January 109:11 | 96:11 104:12 | 91:5,5,9,24 92:5 | liable 37:21 | 59:17,20 60:10 |
| Jesus 10:18 | kept 27:21 | 92:11 93:23 | lien 48:13 | 60:24 62:16,16 |
| jobs 64:7 | kicked 83:5,5 | 96:11 98:24 | light 90:22 | 64:22 65:11,25 |
| John 14:6,13,19 | kind 8:24 12:21 | 99:16 104:7,24 | 103:25 | 66:24 67:1,8,9 |
| 17:11 30:17 | 16:19 17:17 | 107:1,2,9 | limit 22:7 | 67:13,21,21,22 |
| 31:5,21,21 32:6 | 21:8 25:12 46:9 | knowledge 58:19 | limited 15:12 | 69:14 70:7 |
| 32:15 48:17 | 53:8 70:15 | known 49:10,11 | line 5:8 10:3,5,10 | 78:10 80:12,15 |
| 83:15 96:6,18 | 72:17 78:17 | 49:12 | 10:12 12:11 | 86:21 87:22 |
| 97:19,22,25 | 81:14,24 86:25 | knows 62:17 | list 14:2,5,14 | 88:3,10,12 89:5 |
| 99:8,9 100:14 | 87:2 91:15 99:6 | Kubota 7:6 18:20 | 34:15 70:9 76:7 | 89:18,21,23 |
| 101:13 | 104:7 | 19:12 20:7 | 90:13 91:2,23 | 91:16,17 94:5 |
| Journal 31:21 | knew 31:25 62:18 | 28:18,19 37:2 | 92:8 104:11 | 94:12 95:17,25 |
| Judge 18:3 | 62:19,19 90:17 | 67:24 69:7 | listed 7:25 13:22 | 96:2,5,11,12,17 |
| judgment 20:23 | 101:9 105:1,18 | 87:20 88:7,10 | 14:18,21,21,22 | 96:22 97:9 |
| 27:24 47:10 | 108:2 | | 23:1 25:2 33:25 | 98:15 99:2,24 |
| 48:12,22,23 | know 9:5 10:1,21 | L | 34:12 62:3 | 100:5,7,15 |
| 49:4 75:10,11 | 13:23 14:4,8,23 | lady 72:11 | little 39:18 45:4 | 101:19 102:1,6 |
| judicial 37:18 | 15:11,13,24 | land 25:15 | 61:21 81:13 | 102:10,10,13,23 |
| July 40:24 84:22 | 16:13,16 17:14 | Lavesky 86:12 | 99:7,8 | 102:25 103:4,8 |
| 97:7 | 21:4,6,7,20 | Lavinsky 85:21 | Liz 49:18 | 103:19 104:18 |
| jump 53:16 74:10 | 24:10,14 25:12 | 86:10 | loan 67:21 69:12 | 104:21 108:6 |
| June 38:17 39:10 | 25:14,23,23 | law 30:3 31:20 | 69:13,19 70:3 | Lock's 66:8 80:11 |
| 60:25 84:21 | 28:25 29:8,14 | lawsuit 8:16 | 75:3,6 87:22,23 | lockers 25:13 |
| | 31:14,19 32:10 | 17:19 20:20 | 88:4 90:4 | 91:3 |
| K | 33:8 34:17 | 21:25 23:6 | loaned 19:19 | logical 91:1 |
| Kash 13:1,2 | 35:15 38:11 | 31:18,20 47:2 | 67:22 89:22,23 | long 55:14,14,14 |
| 14:21 30:8 34:1 | 41:7 42:17 46:5 | 65:19 99:17,20 | loans 18:23 19:8 | 74:8 |
| 34:6,10,22 35:3 | 46:18,21 48:23 | 100:2,3 101:25 | 77:1,1,21 | longer 58:6 |
| 58:23,24 59:7 | 52:3 53:5 54:8 | 102:3 105:18,21 | located 78:16 | look 53:1 75:18 |
| 59:11,13,22 | 55:22 57:2,4,15 | 106:3,6,9,10 | 82:9 | 82:2 107:9,10 |
| 60:15 61:2 | 58:11,12 59:23 | leave 23:25 93:4 | location 79:8 | looked 86:17 |
| 64:16 66:15 | 60:13,19 62:23 | left 36:22 53:10 | locations 78:21 | looking 17:24 |
| 70:1 75:25 | 63:16 64:21 | 85:12 | Lock 1:7 4:2,6,8 | 77:4 |
| 76:15 82:22 | 65:2,6 70:16,16 | legal 28:8,8 44:10 | 5:19 9:17 11:6 | |
| 84:11,20,23 | 70:21 71:20 | 44:22 66:23 | 18:23 22:18 | loop 24:21 Loretta 57:8,18 |
| 86:23,24 91:19 | 70:21 71:20 72:23 73:3,15 | 67:6 75:15 | 24:9,18 26:2,4 | 58:6 |
| 91:21 92:17,20 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | length 48:9,17 | - | |
| 92:25 93:9 | 73:15,19 74:4 | 49:15 | 30:2,18,19 | lost 47:22 |
| 94:13,15,18 | 74:17 75:8 76:3 | lengthy 95:10 | 36:18 37:17 | lot 41:14 52:19 |
| 105:12 106:25 | 77:20 78:18,20 | let's 18:17 67:19 | 38:1,16,20,24 | 53:4,5 58:1 |
| 107:2,9,17 | 80:8,25 81:1,22 | 70:5 71:10 | 43:20 44:8,10 | 70:22 71:3,3 |
| Kash's 82:23 | 82:7 83:3,8 | 90:12 | 44:21 45:6,9,10 | 73:20 78:19 |
| keep 31:12 36:8 | 84:22 85:12,15 | liabilities 6:5 | 45:22,23 46:6 | 84:7 85:1 88:12 |
| 70:11 75:1 83:1 | 86:2,11,13,14 | 37:15 | 47:17 49:25 | 98:25 103:2 |
| /0.11 /3.1 03.1 | 87:1 88:19,20 | 3/.13 | 50:17 51:12 | 104:3,8,15 |
| | 1 | 1 | ı | 1 |

| - | - 1 - 1 | |
|-----------|---------|---|
| Page | | 6 |
| _ 0. 0, 0 | | |

| | | | | <u> </u> |
|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| love 65:4 66:18 | meet 31:4 58:12 | missing 24:23 | 85:14 | notify 62:7,24 |
| 74:15 105:9 | 86:16 98:7,22 | 76:19 | moving 50:9,12 | November 20:10 |
| | meeting 1:13 4:2 | misspoke 41:19 | 83:17 99:18 | 37:6,7 55:20 |
| M | 4:4 11:5 32:16 | misstate 75:17 | Mowry 53:6 | number 7:7 33:3 |
| M-C- 20:1 | 33:18,19 34:14 | mistake 40:16 | multiple 80:16 | 34:2,12 47:16 |
| machine 88:22,23 | 36:20 60:15,18 | misunderstood | music 10:24 | 50:2,5,14 68:12 |
| 89:13,18 | 60:24 73:23 | 41:9,18 | 12:10 | 86:15 92:15 |
| machinery 87:21 | 92:25 93:7,18 | mobile 101:21 | mute 9:2 35:20 | numbers 51:2 |
| maintain 63:10 | 93:18 95:1 | moment 30:12 | | |
| maintains 75:22 | 98:14 106:24 | 47:7 | N | 0 |
| 75:22,23 | 109:9 | money 7:18 9:14 | name 4:25 28:23 | object 43:23 56:7 |
| maintenance | meetings 31:1,5 | 18:21 19:12,20 | 29:4,4,20 52:13 | 105:13 |
| 25:16 101:13 | 97:21 98:16 | 20:12,17 21:22 | 53:20 71:18 | Objection 43:21 |
| majority 13:16 | 99:3,4,13,19 | 24:20 27:21 | 73:16 96:6,17 | obtained 27:24 |
| 33:22,23 96:1 | 105:4 | 28:8 44:21 | 98:20 | obviously 82:24 |
| making 24:24 | members 14:15 | 45:24 46:6 | name's 14:20 | occupancy 86:21 |
| 72:19 100:4,5 | 14:16 59:5 | 47:20 61:13,17 | named 31:2 53:7 | occurred 42:14 |
| man 52:13 | memory 55:21 | 67:22 69:19,21 | 57:18 58:5 | offered 74:25 |
| managing 14:15 | mention 25:4 | 70:23 74:3,5,15 | names 14:21 | offhand 16:15 |
| Martin 89:21 | 102:21 | 74:17,18,23,24 | 73:14 | office 5:22 10:25 |
| 90:4,4 | mentioned 7:5 | 87:17 88:13,14 | nature 43:6 | 11:25 30:11 |
| Mary 109:5 | 18:3,20 102:15 | 88:16 89:23 | need 18:2 43:8 | 46:17 68:11 |
| Maryland 53:11 | met 25:13 31:5 | 90:2 96:3,10,11 | 48:12 101:12 | 98:10 |
| match 26:9 | 31:10,15 57:19 | 96:13 97:14 | needed 21:22 | officer 4:12 23:9 |
| material 37:23 | 58:17 96:20 | monitor 80:3,12 | 27:1 39:14 | 23:25 26:12 |
| 39:17 43:12 | 98:5,22,25 99:9 | month 40:25 54:9 | 101:15 | 27:8 38:8 95:17 |
| materials 40:23 | 104:4 | 59:24 74:2 | negotiated 56:17 | officers 12:18,24 |
| matter 4:21 | metal 50:25 | months 7:3,13 | 56:24 | 13:7 14:14 18:7 |
| 45:15 | middle 25:21 | 50:3,4 55:17 | never 23:8 27:15 | 18:12 30:7 |
| McCarl 20:1 | Mike 85:21 86:10 | 62:20 73:25 | 30:23 37:22 | Oh 6:23,25 10:18 |
| mean 8:16,20 | 86:11 | 85:14 92:5 | 41:2,9,21 44:12 | 10:19 57:10 |
| 24:8 30:21 | million 34:10,11 | Moore's 90:2 | 45:14 49:8 55:7 | 79:13 91:21 |
| 31:11 32:17 | 61:1,2,6 | morning 35:25 | 56:1 57:19 58:2 | 101:8 102:8 |
| 41:8 48:16 | mind 49:8 86:9 | 36:20 60:9 63:5 | 58:17,17,17,18 | 105:11 |
| 52:19 53:2 | mine 53:5 75:16 | 68:1 | 62:4 64:20 | okay 4:11,15,17 |
| 61:19 63:18,23 | mine's 35:20 | motel's 79:12 | 70:10,23 86:20 | 4:23 5:6,9,12,15 |
| 81:15 82:1 83:2 | 81:14,24 | mother 49:18 | 102:15 104:21 | 5:18 6:15,25 |
| 84:1 87:25 89:9 | minimum 24:1 | motion 60:17,19 | Nick 52:14 | 7:9,21 9:8,12,13 |
| 102:8 | 24:10 27:7 | 62:10 | North 38:2,8,24 | 9:23 10:4,13,21 |
| means 46:12 | minute 7:5 38:15 | move 28:17 32:18 | 41:25 42:11 | 11:3,14,17,20 |
| meant 26:12,13 | 83:20 | 32:21 43:17 | 87:5,9,12 | 11:22 12:4,9,10 |
| 78:3 | minutes 22:10 | 49:19 50:7 63:1 | Notary 109:5,14 | 12:12,15,19 |
| mechanism 92:23 | 31:12 34:13,13 | 67:20 78:6 | notified 37:19,22 | 14:24 15:1,18 |
| medical 59:22 | 95:10 | 104:13 | 40:22 41:2,5 | 15:22 16:5,8,21 |
| 76:4 | misleading 53:14 | moved 84:7,17,20 | 43:11 | 16:25 19:13 |
| | misicualing 55.17 | 1110,0401.7,17,20 | | |
| | | | | |

| _ | - | - | |
|------|-----|-----|-----|
| Pare | - 1 | - 1 | / |
| Lage | _ | _ | . / |

| | | | | Page 117 |
|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| 20.0 11 14 20 | 52.10 | 26.10.21 | 20.0.44.7.45.0 | |
| 20:8,11,14,20 | orange 53:18 | p.m 36:10,21 | 28:8 44:7 45:8 | periodically 64:7 |
| 22:3,12,24 | order 48:12 102:6 | page 3:6,7,8,9 | 45:16 54:24 | 88:18 |
| 24:25 26:10 | 102:13 | 77:6,8,8,10,16 | 55:1,5,6,8,10 | perjure 49:20 |
| 27:5,9 28:17,24 | ordered 17:14 | Pages 37:24 | 56:10,12 64:20 | permission 84:23 |
| 29:7,21 30:15 | ordinary 6:15,19 | paid 15:15 16:4 | 69:10 72:8,10 | permit 86:21 |
| 33:14 34:20 | originally 29:12 | 19:17,24 20:3 | 72:18 74:10,22 | perpetrator |
| 36:8,10,17 37:1 | 54:21 | 20:17 23:8 | 75:6 87:8,11,17 | 78:22 |
| 37:9,11,11,14 | Otto 2:6 3:8 5:4 | 26:15 43:18 | 90:3,4 102:10 | person 8:15 |
| 38:21 39:6,12 | 9:22,24 10:8,11 | 44:6 45:14 | 102:10,20 | 14:18 41:12 |
| 45:1,3 46:22 | 10:11 14:5 | 54:17 56:4,6,9 | paying 56:7 | 56:16 57:16,19 |
| 52:2 56:21 | 29:22,23,25 | 61:25 64:6 69:6 | payment 18:6 | 71:11 73:16 |
| 57:25 59:15 | 36:1,7,12,22,23 | 69:6 70:13,23 | 32:24 33:9 44:4 | 76:3 99:24 |
| 60:7 61:9 63:7 | 36:25 47:5 68:6 | 72:11 75:4 | 69:7 90:5 102:7 | person's 29:19 |
| 64:7 67:18 69:1 | 69:4 92:14,22 | 85:16,16,18 | 102:14 | personal 24:15 |
| 69:18,23 70:5 | 93:4,11,16,20 | 87:16 88:9 | payments 18:11 | personally 6:1 |
| 76:21 78:13 | 93:23 94:3,6,10 | 104:21 | 18:16 70:10 | 50:21 65:10 |
| 80:2 82:6 85:19 | 94:15,18,20 | pallets 85:4 | 78:4 88:4,15,16 | 70:19 85:18 |
| 86:20 88:3,7 | 97:2 105:25 | panets 03.4 paper 19:14 | payroll 63:15,19 | 89:6 91:6 |
| 90:12 93:11,22 | 106:4,8,11 | papers 28:22 | 63:24 64:2,13 | 104:16 |
| 94:18,24 95:7,9 | outfits 41:18 | Pardon 21:13 | 64:15,18,19 | personnel 41:17 |
| 95:13,16,24 | outside 6:19,24 | 46:19 49:7 56:3 | | petition 6:8 33:15 |
| | · · | | pays 70:11 PCB's 41:1 | 90:25 |
| 96:16,22 99:2 | outstanding | 57:11 59:18 | | |
| 100:22 103:20 | 67:21 69:12 | 83:25 87:10 | Pennsylvania 1:1 | petitions 6:2 |
| 104:17 106:11 | owe 7:18 23:3 | parking 41:14 | 30:3 109:6 | phone 9:9 11:3,3 |
| 106:19,20 107:5 | 44:9,10,14,21 | 104:3 | people 14:17 | 11:16,22,24 |
| 107:19,21 108:4 | 45:24 46:6 | part 12:20 47:1 | 15:10,19 22:21 | 12:3,6 35:13 |
| 108:7,10 | 47:20 61:25 | 101:25 | 28:11 62:23 | 57:21 58:18 |
| old 52:13 | owed 9:14 24:16 | particular 89:18 | 63:25 64:3 72:8 | 60:16 68:12,13 |
| old- 81:14 | 24:20 25:3 | parties 48:9 | 73:7,11,20 74:3 | 68:16,19 82:3 |
| old-fashioned | 74:23 | 58:15 | 74:6,15 83:6 | 107:9 |
| 81:24,25 | owes 24:9 | partner 14:20 | 86:8 91:4 | phones 9:10 |
| omissions 6:11 | owned 31:2 51:7 | 15:1 23:4,13,14 | people's 83:18 | Phonetic 58:5 |
| omitted 107:12 | 51:12 52:9,13 | 23:16,19,22 | percent 13:20,24 | 85:22 86:12 |
| once 21:6 27:19 | 89:18 100:10 | 26:1 | 13:25 14:1,10 | photo 52:19 |
| ones 54:7,13 | owner 23:23,24 | partners 14:16 | 14:19 34:3,5,8 | 53:12 |
| open 22:4 75:10 | 24:5,5 26:2 | 17:12 25:7,22 | 35:1 60:10 61:3 | photographs |
| 93:19 95:1 | 62:16 98:13 | 32:1,2 97:17 | 61:4 62:12 85:2 | 31:14 |
| 96:22 106:24 | owners 25:22 | partnership | 92:10 | pick 55:3 101:13 |
| openers 104:4 | ownership 24:7 | 30:21 | percentage 13:19 | pickup 100:9 |
| operable 82:24 | 53:13 | parts 67:4 | percentages | picture 52:16 |
| 84:17 | owns 14:10 50:21 | party 54:10 58:12 | 33:25 60:13 | piece 19:13 89:3 |
| operation 6:20 | 61:1,2 80:12,14 | pattern 17:18 | perfectly 81:21 | 89:7 |
| opinion 27:23 | 80:19 82:13,21 | pause 22:8 | period 47:18 63:9 | pile 83:20 |
| opposed 52:8 | 00.17 02.13,21 | paused 99:17 | 64:10 65:23 | place 4:4 10:18 |
| options 77:2 | P | paused 99.17 pay 19:18 27:16 | 81:3 | 98:7 99:1 |
| options / /.2 | | pay 13.10 41.10 | 01.3 | 70./ 77.1 |
| | | | | |

| _ | - 1 - 1 | \sim |
|------|---------|--------|
| Page | | 8 |
| - 49 | | |

| 101:18 | 40:12 66:1 | 70:17 | 92:15 93:21,25 | 36:18 108:1 |
|-------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| places 98:23,24 | 82:12 84:5 92:9 | Public 109:6,14 | 94:21,23,25 | 109:9 |
| plans 98:16 99:3 | 92:9 103:24 | pull 73:4 | 95:6 103:16,21 | recorded 1:12 |
| play 92:4 | previous 39:6 | pulled 41:14 | 104:18 106:18 | 109:8 |
| playing 9:4 10:24 | primary 95:16,24 | purchase 29:13 | 106:24 107:4 | recording 108:14 |
| 70:15 | principal 85:19 | 29:19 87:23 | 108:5 | 108:15 |
| pleadings 66:23 | prior 6:18 16:21 | purchased 29:16 | quickly 103:24 | records 15:14,18 |
| 67:6 | 46:4 | 51:3 52:24 | quite 88:15 | 15:23 16:3 53:3 |
| please 4:18 9:2 | private 28:21 | 96:25 97:6 | 101:12 104:12 | 70:11,14 75:24 |
| 13:12 57:10,12 | privilege 87:8,11 | 102:23,25 | | 76:2,10 |
| 61:22 84:13 | probably 14:8 | pushing 83:19 | R | recycled 104:9 |
| plenty 74:15 | 16:16,18 20:9 | put 11:15 12:6 | R 109:3 | red 82:10,15,17 |
| plowed 25:16 | 67:16 84:19,22 | 47:23 48:25 | raise 4:18 | 84:15 |
| Plus 46:25 | 97:6 107:7 | 50:15 54:21 | ran 98:12 | redemptions 77:1 |
| point 17:19 21:23 | proceedings 1:12 | 88:14,15,20 | range 16:17 | referred 72:21 |
| 34:21,22 44:12 | 36:14 37:19 | 89:11 96:13 | read 5:24 35:6,6 | referring 50:11 |
| 45:9 46:11 47:4 | 109:8 | 97:13 102:2 | 78:2,3 | 50:18 51:21 |
| 82:18 83:9 | product 45:19 | puts 25:23 | real 7:24,24 | 82:14 |
| 99:16 100:1 | profit 62:2 | | 28:10 48:13 | reflect 6:4 |
| police 41:16 42:1 | progress 99:12 | Q | 81:23 | regard 22:16 |
| 42:12,25 43:5 | promised 96:10 | question 12:15 | really 9:5,13,15 | regarding 19:11 |
| poly 51:20 | 97:13 | 14:13 18:14 | 21:1,3 27:17 | Regardless 39:4 |
| position 28:6,9 | proof 30:16 31:24 | 26:3 34:23 39:3 | 28:15 44:16 | regular 26:15 |
| 28:15 66:2 | 52:7,11,22 | 39:22,25 40:21 | 47:2 53:12,13 | reimburse 18:22 |
| positions 60:3 | 53:12 | 43:10,24 44:9 | 60:12 62:9 | 19:6 20:3 |
| possession 76:9 | properties 86:18 | 44:18,20 45:21 | 64:22 70:4 76:3 | related 6:3,9 |
| possible 106:24 | property 7:11 8:3 | 47:1 49:9 52:6 | 99:5 | relationship |
| post 44:25 45:25 | 19:20 24:6 25:8 | 53:25 54:3 57:6 | reason 7:17 8:13 | 49:21 |
| premium 85:17 | 25:9 32:23 33:6 | 62:15 63:12,22 | 8:15,20 47:7,9 | relayed 98:1 |
| prepare 17:23 | 38:9 42:4 51:7 | 64:14 65:23 | 87:14 | release 37:23 |
| prepared 5:22 | 51:7 52:24 65:1 | 66:22,25 67:2,5 | recall 41:20 50:12 | 40:23 41:3 |
| 83:22,22 | 70:25 74:19 | 67:18 69:5 70:6 | 66:9 67:11 | 43:12 |
| preparing 18:5 | 75:2,3,4 78:7,14 | 76:22 77:9,12 | recalling 43:15 | relevant 44:1 |
| present 2:1 4:5,7 | 79:11 80:15 | 77:13,17,25 | receipts 18:1 | remember 29:3 |
| 4:24 5:10 33:23 | 82:10 83:5,6,18 | 78:1 84:9,12 | receivable 70:8 | 33:4,24 66:13 |
| 61:5 99:21 | 88:8,23 90:5,14 | 91:25 94:7 96:9 | receive 5:21 7:2 | 82:16 89:15 |
| president 4:13,14 | 90:24 91:13,14 | 96:15 98:4 | 7:12 78:4 | 92:1 |
| 5:19 13:3,4 | 92:7 97:10 | 101:3 103:7 | received 37:12 | remotely 79:23 |
| 30:10 58:23,25 | 101:17,19 | 106:5 107:23 | 64:20 77:20 | 80:4,23 |
| 59:1,6,7,11,12 | 102:25 103:5,9 | questioning | 88:8 108:12 | removed 104:8 |
| 59:13,13,16,16 | provide 31:16 | 35:24 | receiving 72:25 | rendered 44:22 |
| 59:20 72:2,3 | 33:13 74:6 | questions 22:4,6 | recessed 36:15 | rent 54:17 56:2,5 |
| 91:17 | 76:23 | 22:11 29:22 | recollection 39:13 | 58:2,15 88:21 |
| pretty 16:18 | provided 14:5 | 36:23 37:25 | 75:14 | 88:22,25 89:12 |
| 17:12 37:5 | 18:23 65:8 | 66:15 76:5,7 | record 4:25 33:12 | 102:7,10,11,14 |
| | 1 | | l | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | iage iij |
|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 102:17,20 | resolution 60:23 | 68:18 | Schur 50:1 51:8,9 | 47:18 64:9,16 |
| rental 55:23 | resolved 39:19 | Roth's 11:25 | 51:10 52:14,24 | 64:21 65:20 |
| 70:10 | response 61:20 | roughly 33:6 | Scotty 83:14 | 68:3,8 80:2 |
| rented 53:24 54:2 | _ | roughly 33:6 rubbish 38:3 | second 12:4 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | responsibility 91:18 | | | 95:2,3,5,8,11,15 |
| 54:17 88:18,20 | | running 73:7 | 28:22 33:21 | 103:14 106:17 |
| 89:12,15,16,19 | responsible 72:4 | <u>S</u> | 47:19 66:25 | 106:21 |
| renter 53:19 | rest 35:23 | salary 23:25 66:6 | 67:7 | share 30:24 |
| renters 70:22 | result 23:6 65:8 | 76:25 77:19,22 | secret 32:1 | shareholder |
| 90:13 91:9,22 | resume 35:22 | 78:3,4 | secretary 30:2,5 | 13:17 14:2 34:1 |
| 91:23 | 36:23 | sale 19:1,11 20:7 | 30:9 58:24 59:1 | 95:25 96:1 |
| renting 54:4 | return 100:15 | 20:12 29:17,19 | 59:25 60:5 | shareholders |
| rents 7:14 71:16 | returns 17:4,7,15 | 37:2 | section 4:1 40:21 | 13:9,15 14:17 |
| reorganization | 17:23 18:2,4 | | see 7:21,23 13:21 | 18:7,12 33:17 |
| 33:16 | 24:15 | sanitation 38:3 | 28:23 41:12 | 33:18,19,22,23 |
| repaid 67:23 | revenues 16:9 | Sarah 2:5 5:1,3 | 53:3 70:5 73:17 | 34:14,16 60:25 |
| 69:15 89:25 | rid 70:25 | 10:7 22:5,11 | 76:3 90:12 | 61:4,5,10,13 |
| 90:1 | right 4:19 5:13 | 93:12,24 94:20 | 107:16 | 62:4,5,7,14,21 |
| repayment 102:7 | 8:6,9 10:5 | sat 98:17 | seen 58:17,18 | shares 13:16 |
| repayments | 11:16,19 12:7 | satisfied 40:7 | sell 6:16 28:18,19 | 30:23 34:2,7,10 |
| 77:20 | 12:23 16:15 | savvy 81:14 | send 6:21 14:2 | 34:25 61:2,2,6 |
| repeat 59:9 61:21 | 20:7 22:1,20,22 | saw 41:13 51:13 | 58:9 102:16 | 62:16 |
| 83:3 103:6 | 24:8 27:13 | 52:16 86:15 | sense 24:24 | she'd 21:8 49:1 |
| repeating 83:2 | 29:21 30:13 | saying 8:2 24:17 | sent 58:10 107:15 | 74:17 |
| report 38:4,5 | 32:14 36:12 | 25:8 28:4 41:20 | separately 93:12 | she'll 81:20 |
| 39:2,3 40:15 | 44:23 55:21 | 45:23 50:15,20 | September 1:14 | sheet 5:21,24 |
| 42:12,24 43:3,5 | 60:7,10 67:25 | 74:17,20 75:1,8 | 36:21 38:17 | shipping 50:19 |
| 43:8 64:19 | 80:11 82:19 | 85:1 91:12 | 39:8,10 97:8 | 50:25 51:21,24 |
| reported 43:4,7 | 86:9 95:17,25 | 98:19 | serial 7:7 | 85:6,13 |
| Reporter 109:5 | 97:5,11,15 | says 7:21 14:10 | served 8:23,23 | Shoot 68:11 |
| represent 45:8,12 | 105:7,10,16,19 | 14:19 60:24 | 22:2 31:20 | short 74:8 |
| 46:12,24 | ringing 9:10 | scenario 61:16,18 | serves 55:21 | shots 100:4,5 |
| representation | road 104:6 | Schapiro 53:21 | service 25:17 | showed 52:16 |
| 43:19 | roads 83:10 | 54:1,15,20 56:4 | 78:8 82:4 104:1 | 55:18 58:1 |
| representative | 104:5 | 56:20,24 57:17 | services 44:11,22 | showing 53:13 |
| 108:6 | Robert 2:3 4:4 | 58:4 | 46:5 | shows 83:13 |
| represented | roles 30:11 59:4 | schedule 7:20 | seven 18:24 23:7 | sideline 86:15 |
| 45:10,13 | Roth 2:9 4:5,7,9 | 77:4 90:20 | 23:23 24:2 | sign 5:20 6:8 |
| representing | 4:13,16 10:1,2 | 92:20 106:25 | 25:11 | 88:21 94:11,12 |
| 46:10 | 10:14 11:2,6,8 | 107:17 | sewage 78:9 | signed 65:9,10 |
| request 44:4 65:8 | 11:11,17,19,22 | scheduled 107:4 | Shanni 2:8 3:9 | silent 14:19 15:1 |
| 98:14 | 12:7 20:16 | schedules 6:3 | 5:10,11,14 9:3 | 17:11 23:4,13 |
| requested 98:23 | 40:11 43:18,21 | 7:23 13:22 | 10:9,10,15,19 | 23:14,16,19,22 |
| required 30:3 | 43:23 44:2,10 | 14:23 16:8 23:1 | 10:23 20:21 | 32:1 97:17 |
| reschedule 93:8 | 44:21 45:10,13 | 25:3,6 90:16 | 27:10 35:16,19 | simply 47:21 |
| 108:14 | 46:3,6 65:9 | school 81:15 | 35:20 45:5 | single 31:1,3,6 |
| | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | Page 120 |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| 72.16.02.6 | 02.2.6.14.17.22 | | 14 12 22 17 | 02.15 |
| 73:16 92:6 | 93:2,6,14,17,22 | Somebody's 9:9 | 14:13 22:17 | swarm 83:15 |
| sister 19:17 27:10 | 93:25 94:24 | someone's 55:5 | 37:14 39:1,23 | swear 4:18,19 |
| 27:18 33:10 | 95:4,7,9,13,21 | son 83:14 | 67:10 70:6 | switched 25:20 |
| 45:17 48:11,19 | 100:1 103:11,20 | sorry 6:23,25 | 76:21 | 25:21 |
| 48:21 49:4,6,12 | 106:19,23 107:6 | 30:14 33:17 | statements 6:3 | switching 74:20 |
| 49:16 63:8 | 107:13,21,22,24 | 61:4,20,23 71:8 | 18:1 83:23 | sworn 47:16 |
| 64:23 65:20 | 108:4,8,11 | 77:16 89:6 94:9 | 92:12 | system 78:13 |
| 69:20 80:8 | small 64:7 | 96:14 97:2 | States 1:1 2:3 | 79:19 80:3,11 |
| sister's 47:6 | snow 25:16 | 101:3 105:25 | stayed 88:22 | 80:14,19,22,24 |
| 63:20 | Snyder 2:4,8 3:5 | 106:1,2 | stem 23:10 | 81:9,13,18,21 |
| sisterly 65:4 | 3:9 4:10,12,18 | sort 82:4 | step 40:20 105:1 | systems 80:17,18 |
| 66:18 105:9 | 4:22 5:10,11,14 | sound 48:8 73:21 | stock 77:1 | 82:2 |
| sit 98:10,10 | 5:16,18 9:3,7,12 | sounds 28:11 | stop 99:4 108:13 | |
| site 41:1 42:21 | 10:2,9,14,15,19 | 48:10 66:1 | stopped 99:7 | T |
| 50:3,6,17 53:19 | 10:23 11:6 | 107:19 | storage 51:1 87:1 | T 109:3,3 |
| 54:3,4,19,21 | 12:13,15 13:1,5 | space 54:4 | store 54:4 56:17 | take 22:8 33:21 |
| 55:15,19 56:18 | 19:25 20:21 | speak 13:12 | stored 53:19 54:2 | 40:20 71:6,12 |
| 82:18 84:6,8,16 | 22:14,16 24:12 | 42:16 | 54:18 72:9 91:4 | 71:14 74:17,19 |
| 85:13,17 86:22 | 25:25 27:9,10 | SPEAKER 11:24 | strategy 38:11 | 74:24 92:19 |
| sitting 35:13 51:6 | 29:24 30:1,16 | 12:3 35:4,14,17 | stuff 25:18 52:20 | 93:9 100:21 |
| situation 48:10 | 32:20 34:1,6,6 | 68:13,16,19 | 65:5 72:9,12,17 | 101:14 |
| 61:24 63:20 | 34:22 35:16,19 | speaking 35:8,10 | 73:6 76:16,18 | taken 20:23 |
| six 7:3,13 18:24 | 36:24 37:1 | specific 60:14 | 83:17 84:7 85:1 | talk 42:1 49:6 |
| 26:24 27:11 | 38:15,16 41:24 | specifically 51:23 | 85:3 86:24 91:4 | 58:12 71:10 |
| 40:25 | 47:18 50:21 | 73:1 | 104:7 | 75:19 93:12 |
| slipping 86:9 | 51:12 58:23,25 | spelling 58:5 | subject 8:5 | 98:11 99:17 |
| Slone 2:3 3:6 4:1 | 61:1,2 64:9 | 85:22 86:12 | submitted 47:16 | talked 7:5 57:1 |
| 4:4,11,14,17,23 | 65:10,20 68:3,8 | spoke 57:8 58:3,6 | substantial 34:2 | 58:13,18 86:7 |
| 5:2,6,9,12,15,17 | 68:22 69:1,3,5 | spoke 57.8 38.5,6 spoken 53:23 | substrate 104:2 | 98:18 99:8 |
| 9:1,9 10:4,7,13 | 75:14 76:16 | 62:14 | sue 71:19 72:19 | talking 27:14 |
| 10:17,21 11:1,4 | 79:5 80:2 84:4 | square 55:11 | 74:3 | 34:22 38:21 |
| 11:4,9,14,18,20 | 92:16,21,25,25 | 58:8 | sued 99:13 102:5 | 39:7,8 42:7 |
| 12:1,5,9,14 22:3 | 94:6,8,13,13,16 | staff 26:15 | 102:12 105:14 | 51:18,23 60:14 |
| 22:13 24:3 25:2 | | stand 75:13 92:1 | summons 105:15 | 60:17 71:9 |
| | 94:19 95:2,5,8 | | | 85:21 89:4 |
| 29:16 35:8,21 | 95:11,14,15 | standing 42:8 | supposed 72:2,3 | 90:19 |
| 36:3,8,13,17 | 102:9 103:14 | start 5:1 22:5 | 96:10 | Tammy 19:18,24 |
| 40:18 44:18,20 | 106:8,17,21,25 | 50:8 71:7,15 | Supposedly 58:13 | 19:24 20:1,1 |
| 44:24 45:20 | 107:2,2,5,18,19 | started 36:20 | sure 22:19 23:16 | 33:11 69:20 |
| 46:2,4,15,18,20 | Snyder's 45:6 | 96:2 | 24:19 31:6 37:6 | tank 51:19 |
| 50:8 58:10 68:4 | 84:11 | state 4:25 32:12 | 41:23 53:1 | tanks 51:19 |
| 68:6,10,15,21 | sold 7:8 18:21 | 43:19 44:5 | 60:12 70:4 | 52:17 |
| 68:24 70:19 | 29:11 61:6 | 47:22 57:20 | 80:25 82:25 | |
| 71:10,13 77:13 | 67:23 88:7 | 58:22 86:1 | 86:23 92:23 | tap 79:15,15 |
| 78:23 84:23 | somebody 11:1 | stated 33:16 44:5 | 96:24 99:5 | taps 78:9 |
| 92:12,14,19 | 54:2,18 79:16 | statement 6:22 | 100:12,14 | task 91:13 92:6 |
| | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |

| | | | | rage 121 |
|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| tavern 98:8,21 | Thanks 22:13 | 101:8 | 38:12,25 39:5 | Trustee 2:3 4:5 |
| 99:1 | thing 48:16 74:21 | thousand 13:15 | 40:7 42:1,6,11 | 5:22 29:8 56:5 |
| tax 17:3,6,15,23 | 75:8 82:5 102:8 | 19:5 55:2 | 42:22,24 87:2,5 | 56:7 70:17 |
| 18:2,4 24:15 | things 23:5 25:6 | threatened 73:2 | 87:9,12 | 72:22,23 84:4,5 |
| 32:23 61:14 | 27:20 28:20 | threats 72:17,25 | track 27:21 | 90:14 |
| 87:8,11 | 37:15 47:8 50:9 | three 18:10,13 | track 27.21 tractor 7:6 18:20 | truth 4:21 41:6,8 |
| · · | | | | · · |
| taxes 15:15,16 | 52:18 61:1 | till 15:8 45:2 | 19:1 28:18,19 | 49:16 |
| 19:20,23 20:4 | 70:20 72:16 | 100:18 | 29:11 67:24 | truthful 27:25 |
| 33:6 61:25 | 75:19 78:19 | time 4:3 6:13 | tractor-trailer | 75:12 |
| 64:19,19 69:21 | 90:18 104:9,11 | 12:24 15:6 | 53:9 90:19 | trying 11:11 12:2 |
| 87:17 | 107:7,8,10,14 | 17:13 20:13,18 | tractor-trailers | 24:20 28:5 32:1 |
| technological | think 10:23 13:20 | 21:3 22:6 27:7 | 52:17 | 38:10 45:21 |
| 81:13 | 17:24 19:16 | 36:1 41:24 | tractors 73:10 | 71:15 72:5 77:6 |
| tell 30:4 54:8 | 21:9 25:3 26:2 | 44:22 45:9 | trailer 53:18 54:1 | 77:16 92:4 |
| 58:24 62:13 | 26:23 29:8,15 | 47:18 48:1 52:4 | 54:5,18,21,25 | 103:16 108:9 |
| 66:16 71:24 | 31:17,21 33:1,1 | 64:11 65:13,15 | 55:4,9,15,18,24 | turn 12:11,12 |
| 78:20 105:3 | 34:10 35:11,14 | 65:23 66:20 | 56:18 58:1,8,14 | turned 44:8 |
| 106:15 | 35:17 37:3,5 | 71:11 73:4 81:1 | 85:12 | TV's 104:10 |
| telling 64:12 66:4 | 38:10 39:19 | 90:15 94:23 | trailers 50:2,6,11 | twice 38:2 68:7 |
| 74:13 80:11 | 40:4,7 41:7,8,11 | 100:6 101:24 | 50:12 52:8 | two 16:13 18:7,17 |
| 81:5,10 91:8,21 | 42:3 44:14,18 | 105:8 | 58:15,16 85:7 | 19:5 24:6,7 |
| ten 50:18 65:6 | 44:20 45:18 | times 15:11 31:15 | 101:19 102:3 | 30:7 41:17 48:9 |
| 79:1 95:10 | 46:8,9,22,23,25 | 65:6 86:19 | TRANSCRIPT | 55:16,16,17 |
| tenant 52:12,14 | 47:2 51:5 53:9 | 88:12 89:1,2,16 | 1:12 | 58:3 62:20 67:4 |
| 73:5 | 59:6,10,12 | tires 103:1,2 | transcription | 68:7 100:19 |
| tenants 52:20 | 60:11 65:2 66:9 | 104:9 | 109:8 | 101:20 |
| 53:8 70:9 71:3 | 66:12,12,14,16 | title 49:25 50:23 | transfer 6:17 | type 31:7,16 |
| 73:4,12,13 | 66:17 74:1 | 50:24 51:10 | 34:7,25 50:6 | types 31:15 |
| 80:18 91:2,9,20 | 75:16 78:8 | 52:7,11 | 51:10 | |
| 91:23 104:5 | 79:11 81:2,11 | titled 100:12 | transferred 49:25 | <u>U</u> |
| tenants' 72:16 | 81:12,16 85:2 | titles 51:2 | 50:5,23 52:8 | U 1:7 4:2,6,8 5:19 |
| terminology | 85:11,11 86:25 | today 4:8 26:4 | treasurer 30:2,5 | 9:17 11:6 18:23 |
| 26:11 | 87:13 89:9,14 | 36:10 45:5 | 30:8,10 59:2 | 22:17 24:9,18 |
| testified 34:24 | 89:15,17,22 | 49:14 53:10 | 60:1,5 | 26:2,4 30:2,18 |
| 41:4,11 51:15 | 90:6 91:25 92:9 | 93:7,18 107:12 | trial 41:19 | 30:19 36:18 |
| 67:25 | 96:24 97:5,6 | told 32:2 40:14 | tried 74:19,22 | 37:17 38:1,16 |
| testify 4:7 47:12 | 99:16 100:17,18 | 53:23 54:23 | truck 55:2 56:25 | 38:20,24 43:20 |
| testifying 5:19 | 103:22 105:11 | 55:7 58:14 60:9 | 70:20 83:8 | 44:8,10,20 45:6 |
| 26:4 | third 54:10 58:12 | 63:2 71:18 83:1 | 100:9,9 101:10 | 45:8,9,22,23 |
| testimony 4:20 | 58:15 | 87:2 | 101:14 | 46:5 47:17 |
| 59:15 63:4 | Thirteen 16:13 | ton 61:12,17 | truckload 85:4 | 49:25 50:17 |
| 66:11 76:15,15 | thirty 54:10 | tons 104:2 | true 71:24,25 | 51:12 52:9,12 |
| thank 9:11 11:18 | thought 8:25 | tops 52:16 | 75:21 84:10 | 58:21 59:16,20 |
| 36:11,13 94:23 | 21:8 64:24 65:3 | tow 83:8 | 109:7,9 | 60:10,23 62:16 |
| 106:19 108:15 | 66:19 78:3 | Township 38:2 | trust 25:9 103:18 | 62:16 64:22 |
| | | | l | |

| | | | | Page 122 |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| | l | l | l | l |
| 65:11,25 66:8 | 86:1,5 | 40:5 | 29:21 36:5,11 | 58:7 81:21 |
| 66:24 67:1,8,9 | utilities 78:7 | wasn't 23:1 25:2 | 93:12 94:22 | worry 45:15 |
| 67:12,21,21,22 | T 7 | 27:14 48:23 | went 11:13 25:21 | worth 51:17 |
| 69:14 70:7 | V | 55:8 60:12 | 31:1,3 38:7,12 | wouldn't 15:22 |
| 78:10 80:11,12 | v 38:19 | 66:20 67:15 | 42:4,24 43:5 | 23:14 47:21 |
| 80:15 86:21 | value 7:3,13 44:8 | 70:17 73:24 | 75:9 105:5 | 48:24 91:3,5 |
| 87:22 88:3,10 | 52:3,3 76:24 | 84:20 91:11 | weren't 16:1 | write 38:8,9,13 |
| 88:12 89:5,18 | verbal 38:14 | 98:11 | 26:22 64:1,2 | written 30:19 |
| 89:21,23 91:16 | versus 43:20 | watching 104:18 | 75:12 | 31:8,12 |
| 91:17 94:5,12 | 58:21 | water 51:19 78:9 | WESTERN 1:1 | wrong 26:11 |
| 95:17,25 96:2,5 | viable 74:9 | wave 73:18 | whatsoever 25:19 | 44:19 |
| 96:11,12,16,22 | vice 4:13,14 5:19 | way 23:5 26:15 | 41:25 | |
| 97:9 98:15 99:2 | 13:4 30:9 58:25 | 44:1 45:4 46:9 | When's 15:6 | X |
| 99:24 100:5,7 | 59:7,12,13 | 50:15 63:17 | white 51:19,20 | |
| 100:15 101:19 | video 55:13 | 64:5 78:2,2 | Whitehouse | Y |
| 102:1,5,10,10 | view 92:15 | 92:2 93:10 | 53:21,25 54:15 | yeah 7:19 8:18 |
| 102:13,23,25 | VIN 51:2 | 105:1 | 54:20 56:4,19 | 11:11 14:3 |
| 103:4,8,19 | Vince 53:7 | we'll 11:3,15,19 | 56:23 57:9,17 | 16:23,23 17:21 |
| 103.4,8,19 | violations 38:9 | 12:5,6 15:1 | 58:4 | 19:16 20:14 |
| * | vote 62:11 | | WiFi 79:11,12,16 | 26:21 29:7 |
| U.S 5:22 | vote 02.11 | 22:4,8,8,9 68:10 | , , | 30:25 35:7 36:5 |
| unanimous 62:11 | \mathbf{W} | 107:3,16 108:14 | 79:22 80:23 | 39:6 46:22 |
| unavailable | W-2's 15:17,20 | we're 12:8,12 | 81:1 | 48:15 51:13 |
| 76:12 | 15:25 26:18,19 | 14:25 17:25 | William 2:6 5:4 | 52:10 60:11 |
| unaware 61:15 | wage 24:1,10 | 18:1,5 22:6,7 | willing 72:8,10 | 64:8 65:13 |
| understand 28:3 | 27:7 | 36:17 45:21 | wires 104:1 | 67:14 68:18,22 |
| 41:24 48:3,7 | wages 23:10 24:1 | 57:12 60:2 | wish 6:12 | 69:20 70:14 |
| 59:8 71:23 | 67:14,15 69:9 | 68:22,23 71:2 | withholding | 72:24 78:2 |
| 73:13 81:20 | 69:10 | 87:18 92:9,9 | 15:15 | 82:19,21,25 |
| understanding | wait 17:16 | 107:16,17 108:4 | WITNESS 3:5 | 85:8 86:7 88:25 |
| 38:6 54:14,15 | walk 32:14 46:23 | 108:8,8,12 | woman 57:17 | 90:11 91:7,19 |
| 64:25 | walk 32:14 40:23 want 22:19 24:4 | we've 32:11 | 58:4 | · · |
| understands | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 49:11,12 53:22 | words 46:5 | 92:2,7 93:14 |
| 81:22 | 44:16 49:20 | 53:22 81:2 | 105:12 | 97:19 99:15 |
| UNIDENTIFIED | 54:23 55:7,9,10 | 92:14 | work 21:2,5 23:7 | 100:19 101:1,8 |
| 11:24 12:3 35:4 | 55:10 58:8 | Wednesday 31:1 | 25:1,11 27:3 | 101:9 102:2,4 |
| 35:14,17 68:13 | 62:22 71:17,19 | 31:4 98:6 | 45:19 72:5 | 104:14 |
| 68:16,19 | 72:12 74:4 75:1 | weeds 25:15 | 84:23 104:15,15 | year 7:8 15:13 |
| unit 37:20,23 | 75:2,2,4,4,18 | week 27:3 65:6 | 105:6,14 | 18:15 19:20 |
| 40:23 41:3 | 83:1 104:13 | weekly 30:25 | worked 15:19 | 20:22 22:22,22 |
| 43:11 | 106:25 107:25 | 96:21 105:3 | 27:7,12 47:19 | 26:24 27:12 |
| United 1:1 2:3 | 108:1 | weeks 40:25 | 64:1,3,10,17,21 | 28:13 33:5,6,7 |
| unlimited 84:6 | wanted 17:16 | welcome 106:22 | 64:22 65:21 | 40:25 76:22 |
| updated 90:21 | 18:4 86:16 98:3 | Wenrich 2:5 3:7 | 66:16 | 99:10,11 |
| updates 99:12 | wants 29:16 | 5:1,2,3,7 9:20 | workers 63:25 | years 6:18 15:12 |
| USAAG 85:19 | warning 39:20 | 10:6 22:5,12,15 | works 23:16 36:7 | 15:21 16:5,21 |
| 05000 05.17 | _ | 10.0 44.3,14,13 | WUINS 43.10 30./ | |
| | | | | |

| _ | 1 0 0 |
|-----------|-------|
| \square | 1 7 2 |
| raue | 1 /) |
| - 49 | |
| | |

| | | | Page | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|
| 10 0 10 17 24 | 07.24.100.17.22 | 20,000,67,24 | l I | |
| 18:8,10,17,24 | 97:24 100:17,22 | 38,000 67:24 | | |
| 23:8,23 24:2 | 101:5 103:5,9 | 4 | | |
| 25:11 27:12 | 2016 29:16 65:22 | | | |
| 32:25 40:13 | 87:25 89:10 | 434:11 | | |
| 49:12 51:4 | 2017 45:13 | 40-hour 27:3 | | |
| 52:15 53:2 | 2018 97:18,23 | 400 34:10 | | |
| 55:16,16 56:5 | 99:8 | 45 49:12 | | |
| 58:3 63:3 66:13 | 2019 16:14,20 | 45,000 19:1,2 | | |
| 80:5 86:13 89:9 | 38:17 39:10 | 29:9 37:12 88:8 | | |
| 100:16,20 | 62:18 | 88:10 | | |
| yep 57:1 77:17 | 2020 16:10 17:4 | | | |
| | 55:19,20 57:23 | 5 | | |
| Z | 65:22 100:19,20 | 5 3:6 38:17 39:8 | | |
| | 100:22 101:6 | 39:10 61:6 | | |
| 0 | 103:5,9 | 5/2015 96:25 | | |
| 1 | 2021 16:9 17:4 | 51 13:20,24 | | |
| 1 | 18:19 20:10,10 | | | |
| 1.18 61:4 | 37:4,6 38:18 | 6 | | |
| 10 34:3 37:24 | 39:11 45:14 | 6,000 51:17 | | |
| 10,000 21:23 45:8 | 2022 1:14 40:24 | 65 37:24 77:9 | | |
| 10,000-gallon | 60:25 | 65,000 29:15 | | |
| 51:19 | 2023 109:11 | | | |
| 100 48:24 | 21 8:3 16:13 | 7 | | |
| 1099's 26:17,20 | | 7 1:3 | | |
| 26:22 | 18:18 38:17 | 7,000 19:19 20:3 | | |
| 12,000 16:10 | 39:10 100:19 | 33:2,7 69:24 | | |
| 13 77:8,10,16 | 22 3:7 18:18 | 70- 101:20 | | |
| 13,000 16:10 | 52:15 53:2 | 75 61:2 | | |
| 130,000 48:24 | 100:19 | | | |
| 66:6 | 22-20823- 36:18 | 8 | | |
| 14 35:24 | 22-20823-GLT | 800-plus 33:19 | | |
| 14140 78:7 | 1:2 4:3 | 0 | | |
| 15 37:6,7 | 25 14:10,19 | 9 | | |
| 18 97:24 | 260,000 28:1 66:7 | 9 1:14 36:21 | | |
| 19 37:25 77:9 | 27th 109:11 | 37:24 | | |
| | 28 14:14 | 90 13:25 14:1 | | |
| 2 | 29 3:8 | 19:23 34:4,8 | | |
| 2,000 27:13 | | 35:1 60:10 | | |
| 2:30 36:3,4,9,10 | 3 | 92:10 | | |
| 36:21 | 3,000 72:12 | 95 3:9 | | |
| 20 18:18 43:10 | 30 60:25 77:9,13 | 98 62:11 92:10 | | |
| 51:3 100:18 | 77:15,18 | 98.82 61:3 | | |
| 2004 92:20 93:9 | 341 73:23 92:24 | 99,000 22:24 23:2 | | |
| 107:1 | 341(a) 1:13 4:2 | 25:4 | | |
| 2015 12:17 17:10 | 36:19 109:9 | | | |
| 90:24 97:18,22 | 345 61:1 | | | |
| 70.27 77.10,22 | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | |
| | | | | |

Transcript of the Testimony of

CONT 341 MEETING OF CREDITORS

January 17, 2023

IN RE: U LOCK, INC.



412-261-2323 depo@akf.com www.akf.com

BIROS APPENDIX 0136

EXHIBIT A

| | 1 |
|--|---|
| IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANI | |
| Bankruptcy No. 22-20823-GLT | |
| Chapter 7 | |
| - | |
| | |
| In re: | |
| U LOCK INC., | |
| Debtor.) | / |
| | ′ |
| | |
| TRANSCRIPT OF RECORDED PROCEEDINGS: | |
| CONTINUED 341 MEETING OF CREDITORS | |
| January 6, 2023 | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| | | 2 |
|----|---|---|
| 1 | PRESENT: | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | Robert H. Slone, Esquire, United States Trustee | |
| 5 | Charles O. Zebley, Jr., Esquire, Trustee for Shanni Snyder | |
| 6 | Kash Snyder | |
| 7 | George Snyder | |
| 8 | Kirk B. Burkley, Esquire | |
| 9 | Sarah Wenrich, Esquire | |
| 10 | William Otto, Esquire | |
| 11 | Christine Biros | |
| 12 | John B. Joyce, Esquire | |
| 13 | Beth L. Slaby, Esquire | |
| 14 | Jeremy J. Kobeski, Esquire | |
| 15 | J. Allen Roth, Esquire | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |

| | | 3 |
|----|--|---|
| 1 | INDEX | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | EXAMINATION OF KASH SNYDER BY MR. SLONE - PAGE 5 | |
| 5 | EXAMINATION OF KASH SNYDER BY MR. BURKLEY - PAGE 16 | |
| 6 | EXAMINATION OF KASH SNYDER BY MR. ZEBLEY - PAGE 25 | |
| 7 | EXAMINATION OF GEORGE SNYDER BY MR. ZEBLEY - PAGE 27 | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | EXHIBITS INTRODUCED: (NONE) | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | |

CONT 341 MEETING OF CREDITORS - 1/17/2023

| | 4 |
|----|---|
| 1 | MR. SLONE: I'll call the this |
| 2 | will be a meeting of creditors in the case of |
| 3 | U Lock Inc., Case 22-20823-GLT. This is the |
| 4 | time of a continued meeting of creditors in the |
| 5 | U Lock case. The original meeting of creditors |
| 6 | was held September 9, 2022. I am Robert Slone, |
| 7 | the interim Trustee. |
| 8 | We specifically scheduled this for the |
| 9 | testimony of Kash Snyder. Is Kash Snyder |
| 10 | present? |
| 11 | MR. KASH SNYDER: Here, present. |
| 12 | MR. SLONE: Okay. You've got to |
| 13 | speak up so we can all hear you. There's a |
| 14 | bunch of creditors present. I'm going to ask |
| 15 | you to put your name on for the record, |
| 16 | starting with Mr. Zebley. Mr. Zebley? |
| 17 | MR. ZEBLEY: Yes, this is Charles |
| 18 | Zebley. I am the Chapter 7 Trustee for Shanni |
| 19 | Snyder. |
| 20 | MR. SLONE: Okay. Next Beth and |
| 21 | Jeremy? |
| 22 | MS. SLABY: Yes, Beth Slaby and |
| 23 | Jeremy Kobeski for Shanni Snyder. |
| 24 | MR. SLONE: Okay. Mr. Burkley? |
| 25 | MR. BURKLEY: Yes, Kirk Burkley, |

CONT 341 MEETING OF CREDITORS - 1/17/2023

| | | 5 |
|----|---|---|
| 1 | Sarah Wenrich, and William Otto for | |
| 2 | Christine Biros. | |
| 3 | MR. SLONE: And Christine Biros | |
| 4 | is also present? | |
| 5 | MS. BIROS: Yes. | |
| 6 | MR. BURKLEY: That's correct. | |
| 7 | MR. SLONE: And George Snyder, | |
| 8 | you're present also? | |
| 9 | MR. GEORGE SNYDER: Yes, present. | |
| 10 | MR. SLONE: Okay. And attorney | |
| 11 | for U Lock? | |
| 12 | MR. ROTH: Allen Roth here. | |
| 13 | MR. SLONE: Okay. And Kash | |
| 14 | Snyder, Mr. Snyder, please raise your right | |
| 15 | hand. Do you swear that the testimony | |
| 16 | you're about to give in this matter to be | |
| 17 | the truth? | |
| 18 | MR. KASH SNYDER: I do. | |
| 19 | MR. SLONE: Mr. Snyder, you've | |
| 20 | got to speak up so we can all hear you, | |
| 21 | okay? | |
| 22 | MR. KASH SNYDER: All right. I | |
| 23 | I do. | |
| 24 | MR. SLONE: Good, you're | |
| 25 | you're coming in strong and clear now. | |
| | | |

CONT 341 MEETING OF CREDITORS - 1/17/2023

| | | 6 |
|----|--|---|
| 1 | MR. KASH SNYDER: Okay. | |
| 2 | EXAMINATION OF KASH SNYDER: | |
| 3 | BY MR. SLONE | |
| 4 | Q. Okay, Mr. Snyder, when what | |
| 5 | relationship do you have with U Lock Inc.? | |
| 6 | A. I worked there and I was a corporate | |
| 7 | officer there since the beginning. | |
| 8 | Q. Okay. And when when did the | |
| 9 | company start? | |
| 10 | A. That would be 2015, July I believe. | |
| 11 | Q. Okay. And who are the other | |
| 12 | officers beside yourself? | |
| 13 | A. To the best of my recollection, and | |
| 14 | this, this is this could be wrong, but I | |
| 15 | don't remember ever writing down. My | |
| 16 | brother George, Christine Biros, John Biros, | |
| 17 | and myself were officers or owners or I | |
| 18 | mean, when I wrote things that I, to my | |
| 19 | recollection, I started a bank account, I | |
| 20 | think I wrote myself as the director. And | |
| 21 | the truth is, the only thing I ever remember | |
| 22 | writing when I attached my name to something | |
| 23 | was director. | |
| 24 | So we were going to do an official | |
| 25 | corporate structure or something like that, | |
| | | |

7 but it was, you know, sort of treading water 1 2 for a few years, really at Christine's 3 direction, which was fine with me; and in 4 the end I think we were all four just going to split that, you know, split the officer 5 6 roles or whatever. 7 0. Okay. 8 I don't know where I ever ended up. 9 Vice president I believe I had been named as 10 being before. But like I said, that, that, 11 I remember, I mean, I thought Christine 12 maybe was vice at one time also. So that's 13 really unclear to me. But I know that I 14 signed off personally on things as director. 15 Ο. What -- who are the shareholders of 16 the corporation? 17 That would be myself, that would be 18 John, that would be Christine, that would be 19 George. Then there is like minor 2.0 shareholders to my knowledge, and that's, I don't know a whole lot about that end of it. 2.1 22 I -- I don't know about even the majority 23 shareholder end it very, very much, but I 2.4 know, like I said, the four of us were

always, you know, a big part of it.

| | | 8 |
|----|---|---|
| 1 | Q. Did the corporation have employees? | |
| 2 | A. No, we never had employees. We | |
| 3 | always had people helping us, but never | |
| 4 | anything official or long-term or anything | |
| 5 | like that. | |
| 6 | Q. Did you have 1099 workers, people | |
| 7 | that you gave 1099 forms to? | |
| 8 | A. No, we never did that. | |
| 9 | Q. Never did? | |
| 10 | A. No, sir. | |
| 11 | Q. Now, you said you had people help | |
| 12 | out, but they weren't paid then; is that | |
| 13 | correct? | |
| 14 | A. Yeah, everyone, anyone who helped | |
| 15 | well, there was always Christine said to | |
| 16 | pay people less than 600. She said her | |
| 17 | employees I guess for her machine business, | |
| 18 | you know, that would that would help, you | |
| 19 | know, they would I don't know what the | |
| 20 | reason was. I guess it was for, to keep | |
| 21 | things simple. But so it was limited hours | |
| 22 | on people where, you know, I think the | |
| 23 | number was, well, I'm almost positive the | |
| 24 | number was \$600 per year, everyone had to be | |

25

below that.

| | 9 |
|-----|---|
| 1 | Q. Okay, so you never issued any W-2's |
| 2 | or 1099's; is that correct? |
| 3 | A. That's correct. |
| 4 | Q. Did the corporation have an |
| 5 | accountant? |
| 6 | A. No, we didn't. We talked to one one |
| 7 | time, and it just, I think at the time I |
| 8 | think we were ahead of ourselves. I didn't |
| 9 | get the go-ahead, well, U Lock didn't get |
| L 0 | the go-ahead from Christine to go ahead and |
| 1 | file and put names on things. And what we |
| _2 | were told at the time was that of course we |
| 13 | should file, but there's no harm because we |
| 4 | were operating at a loss, but we have to do |
| _5 | it. That's what, I mean, that's what he |
| L 6 | told us. |
| _7 | So we, you know, we didn't hire him, but |
| 8 ـ | we just thought that the penalty on zero |
| _9 | dollars that we made would be zero, so we |
| 20 | were just relying on Christine to pull the |
| 21 | trigger on it, which we had to wait till, |
| 22 | they had a lawsuit going on or something |
| 23 | that we had to wait for. So it was sort of |
| 24 | like |
| 25 | Q. Okay, the question was, did you have |

| | | 10 |
|-----|--|----|
| 1 | an accountant; you answered no? | |
| 2 | A. I don't know. | |
| 3 | Q. Did the corporation ever file any | |
| 4 | tax returns? | |
| 5 | A. No. | |
| 6 | Q. What would be the gross, on your | |
| 7 | bankruptcy schedules for 2021 and 2020, I | |
| 8 | believe the gross revenue for one year was | |
| 9 | 13,000, approximately 13,000, and for 2020 | |
| L 0 | approximately 12,000. Are those numbers | |
| 1 | accurate? | |
| _2 | A. That's, I think that's very | |
| 13 | accurate. Anytime, it always seemed like a | |
| 4 | thousand a month, is estimations. | |
| _5 | Q. Would that be consistent over the | |
| L 6 | life of the corporation? | |
| _7 | A. It was. | |
| 8 ـ | Q. So the corporation you're saying | |
| 9 | operated at a loss; is that correct? | |
| 20 | A. Yes. | |
| 21 | Q. Were the officers and insiders, that | |
| 22 | would be the shareholders, given payments of | |
| 23 | salary or anything else? | |
| 24 | A. No. I would I would think more | |
| 25 | I'm owed some money, but I don't know if | |
| | | |

| | | 11 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | that's the time, the time and place for | |
| 2 | that. | |
| 3 | Q. Did any of the officers or insiders | |
| 4 | make loans to U Lock, give U Lock money? | |
| 5 | A. Yes. | |
| 6 | Q. Okay. | |
| 7 | A. That would be myself, that would be | |
| 8 | George, John, Chris. All of us put in money | |
| 9 | through the years. | |
| 10 | Q. And did the corporation pay, pay | |
| 11 | back any of these people that gave loans? | |
| 12 | A. Yes, U Lock did, and I don't know | |
| 13 | the exact figures on that. I know I got | |
| 14 | repaid a decent amount last year. Or no, | |
| 15 | no, I'm sorry, two years ago. But, you | |
| 16 | know, the exact things, I would think maybe | |
| 17 | send those questions towards George. I can | |
| 18 | hand him the phone if | |
| 19 | Q. We're taking your testimony right | |
| 20 | now. I'm going to ask, now I had given a | |
| 21 | list of items to George Snyder to, to bring | |
| 22 | to me, and we'll add this: Any money that | |
| 23 | was paid to any of the insiders over the | |
| 24 | last four years, I want something to show | |

25

that.

| | | 12 |
|-----|---|----|
| 1 | A. Okay. There is several there are | |
| 2 | several documents Allen's paralegal just | |
| 3 | emailed you before the meeting. | |
| 4 | Q. Yeah, I didn't get a chance to look | |
| 5 | at that. | |
| 6 | A. Okay. | |
| 7 | Q. I have it in front of me here, and | |
| 8 | it shows some. But just give me, you know, | |
| 9 | I'll this will be good, but get me the | |
| L 0 | other stuff, too. | |
| 1 | A. We will. | |
| _2 | Q. That's the information that was | |
| _3 | requested at the $9/19$, or I mean the meeting | |
| 4 | of creditors, and the list was given to | |
| _5 | George Snyder and also sent to Allen Roth. | |
| L 6 | So I need that information. Start bringing | |
| _7 | that together. | |
| 8_ | There was a 2021 Kubota that was sold, or | |
| _9 | in 2021 the Kubota was sold for \$45,000. | |
| 20 | Now, that Kubota was owned by the | |
| 21 | corporation; is that correct? | |
| 22 | A. That's correct. | |
| 23 | Q. Okay, now where did that money go? | |
| 24 | A. Back into U Lock, to my knowledge | |
| 25 | was most of it. Some went to myself, which | |
| | | |

unfortunately went back to U Lock. But specifics on that, they're included in what was just emailed to you.

- Q. Okay, I'll need -- I'll need that information. And then there was a question about some of that money was used to pay real estate taxes. I need something to show what real estate taxes were paid.
- A. Okay. That will be in an email that you -- that was sent to you.
- Q. You mean the stuff that was sent to me this morning?
 - A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. Okay. It just says it's a promissory note signed by George Snyder, but I need the receipt from the tax claimed, from the tax. There, look, there was something here that didn't come out. Maybe that's the receipt that I'm looking for. So I need the receipt to show the payment of the real estate taxes.
- A. Okay, I believe it is in there, and if it's fuzzy, it will be re-sent. George will get you that. Anything, anything that there's a gap in, we'll send.

| | | 14 |
|-----|--|----|
| 1 | Q. Okay. Very good. Were there any | |
| 2 | other sales of assets other than the | |
| 3 | other than in the ordinary course of | |
| 4 | business that were made? | |
| 5 | A. Nothing to my knowledge. John took | |
| 6 | the company car back. That wasn't sold. He | |
| 7 | already owned that. There was that tractor. | |
| 8 | I don't think any, any nothing else | |
| 9 | comes to mind. I think it's no. I think | |
| L 0 | the answer would be a no. | |
| 1 | Q. Okay. Did U Lock make any payments | |
| _2 | to Mr. Roth for this bankruptcy? | |
| 13 | A. No. | |
| 4 | Q. Did anybody pay Mr. Roth for work on | |
| 15 | this bankruptcy case? | |
| 6 | A. No. | |
| _7 | Q. Shanni Snyder filed a lawsuit in | |
| 8 . | Federal Court for, I guess it was for wages. | |
| 9 | Are you familiar with that case? | |
| 20 | A. I know that it was filed, but I'm | |
| 21 | not familiar. | |
| 22 | Q. Who made the decision on behalf of U | |
| 23 | Lock not to participate in that case? | |
| 24 | A. I don't know. I I felt like we | |
| 25 | were all in the same situation; nobody was | |
| | | |

2.0

2.1

2.4

going to get paid -- developed and making money. And to my knowledge everybody, I mean, it seems like Biroses were happy that she was doing that work. George was -- I mean, I was fine with it; George was fine with it. It was really not, you know, you know, if -- if Christine was okay with things, we were okay with things.

- Q. Well, why didn't you just agree to make a payment to her? She filed a lawsuit.

 If you all agreed, why didn't you just make arrangements to pay her or do something?
- A. I had no money. Christine cut off the money. And I've -- I've been less handson the last couple years because, just, you know, because of that. So as far as, as far as Shanni goes, it just, I mean, I didn't even think she was -- I don't -- I don't know. I don't know that -- nothing happened, so she wasn't going to be -- you know, she was volunteering and then, you know, money never came. So I thought that was understood. But that was -- that's between George; that's between Christine.
 - Q. George filed a, in this, in the

| | | 16 |
|-----|--|----|
| 1 | bankruptcy, filed a wage claim for \$99,000. | |
| 2 | Are you familiar with that? | |
| 3 | A. No. Well, we may have I did see | |
| 4 | that on the schedule, but I'm not familiar | |
| 5 | with details on that. | |
| 6 | Q. There was an order of Court entered | |
| 7 | in the U Lock case dated 12/20/22 for the | |
| 8 | sale of tangible and intangible assets. | |
| 9 | Now, an appeal was taken the other day | |
| L 0 | appealing that order. Who authorized that | |
| 1 | appeal being filed? | |
| _2 | A. I I'm not familiar. That would | |
| 13 | most likely be George. | |
| 4 | Q. Would you know what the basis of the | |
| _5 | appeal is? | |
| L 6 | A. Say that again, please? | |
| _7 | Q. Do you know what the basis of that | |
| 8_ | appeal is? | |
| _9 | A. No, I'm not I'm not familiar. | |
| 20 | Q. Do you know who would who paid | |
| 21 | the filing fee for the appeal? | |
| 22 | A. I do not know. | |
| 23 | MR. SLONE: Okay, I'm going to | |
| 24 | let the other, other parties ask you | |
| 25 | questions at this point. Who wants to go | |
| | | |

| | | 17 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | next? | |
| 2 | MR. BURKLEY: I will go. This is | |
| 3 | Kirk Burkley. | |
| 4 | MR. SLONE: Okay, Mr. Burkley, go | |
| 5 | ahead. | |
| 6 | MR. BURKLEY: Thank you. | |
| 7 | EXAMINATION OF KASH SNYDER: | |
| 8 | BY MR. BURKLEY | |
| 9 | Q. Mr. Snyder, I only have a few | |
| 10 | questions for you here today. But my first | |
| 11 | question is, have you personally ever seen | |
| 12 | written bylaws for U Lock? | |
| 13 | A. Not to my recollection. | |
| 14 | Q. Do you believe that any exist? | |
| 15 | A. I have to be honest, I'm iffy on | |
| 16 | that because I just don't, I don't know. | |
| 17 | Q. Have you personally ever seen a | |
| 18 | shareholder agreement for U Lock? | |
| 19 | A. I have not. | |
| 20 | Q. All right. Same question, do you | |
| 21 | believe that one exists? | |
| 22 | A. I do. | |
| 23 | Q. All right. Why do you believe that? | |
| 24 | A. Because there were four of us in | |
| 25 | there and we talked about percentages and | |
| | | |

| | | 18 |
|-----|---|----|
| 1 | shares and things. But I could be wrong on | |
| 2 | it, but I just, what I thought. | |
| 3 | Q. If one existed, who would be in | |
| 4 | possession of it? | |
| 5 | A. That's a good question. I don't | |
| 6 | know. Maybe I don't know. I'd just be | |
| 7 | speculating. | |
| 8 | Q. All right, you testified previously | |
| 9 | that you are in fact a shareholder of U | |
| L 0 | Lock; correct? | |
| 1 | A. I believe I am, yes, that is | |
| _2 | correct. That is what I testified. | |
| 13 | Q. And how many shares do you own? | |
| 4 | A. Oh, I believe it's in the millions, | |
| 15 | like 4 million, but I think there's 100 | |
| 6 | million shares, so it amounts to not a lot. | |
| _7 | Q. Have you ever received a share, a | |
| 8 . | certificate for your shares? | |
| 9 | A. No, I have not. | |
| 20 | Q. Do you know if other shareholders | |
| 21 | received certificates evidencing their | |
| 22 | ownership? | |
| 23 | A. I don't know. | |
| 24 | Q. Who made the decision to issue 100 | |
| 25 | million shares for this corporation? | |
| | | |

| 19 |
|--|
| A. I would think that would be, well, |
| George, Christine, John. I don't know. |
| Between the three of them. I'd say maybe |
| George or Christine would have to be who I |
| would think. |
| Q. Do you know if George or Christine, |
| do you know if either one of them or |
| yourself received any advice from outside |
| individuals to issue the 100 million shares? |
| A. I don't know. |
| Q. Did you ever talk to anybody other |
| than Christine, John, or George about the |
| number of shares to be issued for U Lock? |
| A. I did not. |
| Q. You testified that you've been an |
| officer since the beginning, and I believe |
| you said that you were the vice president; |
| is that correct? |
| A. My testimony was sort of that that's |
| ambiguous to me. But I know I've signed |

- things as director, and that's the best I could do with that. I apologize.
 - Q. Is George also a director?
- A. I have seen him do that before, so I guess so. I've seen him sign the same way.

Q. What were George's duties as an officer and director?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- A. Well, I don't know the official capacity, but we just always all worked. I mean, he lined up -- he sort of seemed like he quarterbacked the work to cleaning up the property, the getting rid of garbage, getting rid of, you know, things that we would recycle. He would, you know, fix things that needed fixed. He would pay workers. Between him and John they would pay workers. And then sometimes he dealt with tenants. Not much when I was around a lot. The less I've been around, the more he does that.
- Q. Did George have check-signing authority?
- A. I don't think so. I think that was just me.
 - Q. That was just you? Okay.
- A. As far as the bank, it was only me, but I would do online stuff. Let me think. George sort of, with, as far as the working end of things go, he would -- he would meet with Christine. I was there probably 90

| | | 21 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | percent of the time, but he was 100 percent | |
| 2 | as far as meeting with her weekly. With | |
| 3 | John, that was almost daily. I'm sorry, I'm | |
| 4 | like | |
| 5 | Q. Where did the company bank? Oh, go | |
| 6 | ahead, sorry. | |
| 7 | A. Oh, that's okay. Citizens. I was | |
| 8 | I was still going over George's duties. | |
| 9 | Are we finished with that or, 'cause there | |
| 10 | was, you know, the grass cutting, the | |
| 11 | regular stuff that needs regular | |
| 12 | maintenance. But he did, you know, he | |
| 13 | installed the roads and did the asphalt on | |
| 14 | the property, a huge portion of the | |
| 15 | property. I mean, it might be almost half | |
| 16 | the property. But did electric work. | |
| 17 | Q. And how did | |
| 18 | A. There was there were years of | |
| 19 | work. | |
| 20 | Q. How did George's how did how | |
| 21 | did his, if in fact they were different, how | |
| 22 | did George's responsibilities and duties | |
| 23 | differ from yours? | |
| 24 | A. Well, I'd say he was he was more | |
| 25 | hands-on in maintenance and probably like a | |

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

better skill set than me as far as that goes. As far as dealing with John and Christine, George really found the deal and included them. So, you know, once Christine invested, I mean, she was, fair is fair, she was the boss. They sort of jumped whenever she said something, even if we had to leave U Lock to go to her house and, you know, she had him do excavating at her house and we just, I mean, he jumped, took machines in there and we (Inaudible) there. That's just, you know, so he was with -- him and her were -- I'd say it was like, say it was me and George and her and John. I'd say she was the boss of her and John, that he was the boss of me and him, but that's -- that's nothing official, but I -- just that's the way it went.

- Q. Did you ever have Board of Directors meetings?
- A. Yeah, the -- the Wednesdays that we would meet at their -- at their business, that was -- that was U Lock-related every time, so that was every Wednesday. And John and George saw each other daily. They

| typically would go to Arby's and they'd, |
|--|
| same thing, it was, you know I don't I |
| don't know if that was more fluff than |
| anything, but at the at the weekly |
| meetings, Caesar's Bar down in Turtle Creek |
| was the that's where we talked about U |
| Lock. And that was without exception every |
| Wednesday. And like I said, if I I might |
| have missed one or two in the years that we |
| did it. And the only time I quit going was |
| when they filed a lawsuit, which was, I |
| think we found out about it like a day after |
| we met with them and we were like |

Q. Mr. Snyder.

- A. They didn't say anything.
- Q. Mr. Snyder, if we -- if we can stay on, on the questions.
 - A. Yeah, sorry.
- Q. Did you consider -- did you consider those to be Board of Directors meetings?
- A. Yeah, I could -- I could label them that.
- Q. All right. Did you keep minutes from those meetings? Did the company keep minutes from those Board of Directors

2.4

meetings?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

- A. No, but she would keep notes and --
- Q. Who is she?
- A. Oh, I'm sorry. Christine Biros at times would keep notes, and once in a while we would, but it wasn't -- it wasn't like your typical meeting. I know John did things on napkins at different restaurants and things like that, but at the weekly meetings at Caesar's --
 - Q. Are --
- A. Anything, anything I have would be maybe with my things that are still at U
- Q. Okay, so I was just going to ask you, are you in possession of any minutes that were sent out after any Board of Directors meeting?
- A. Yes. But I'm not calling -- I mean, minutes, but they're -- you're calling them minutes, and I understand like it's, you could sort of like label them that way, but they're basically just notes or like a to-do list.
 - Q. Did you -- did you ever attend or

| | | 25 |
|-----|--|----|
| 1 | were notices ever sent out notifying | |
| 2 | directors that there would be a Board of | |
| 3 | Directors meeting, written notices? | |
| 4 | A. No. It was it was sort of hush- | |
| 5 | hush and it was, you know, Christine was | |
| 6 | under investigation. I think maybe the | |
| 7 | whole family was; I'm not sure. But there | |
| 8 | was just, we sort of kept things just quiet, | |
| 9 | but it was, I mean, it was what was going | |
| L O | on was just sort of day to day running the | |
| 1 | business waiting to develop this property, | |
| _2 | so | |
| 13 | Q. Did you ever attend an annual | |
| 4 | meeting of the shareholders? | |
| 15 | A. Nothing labeled that way. | |
| - 6 | Q. Do you know if a notice was ever | |
| _7 | sent out to all shareholders notifying them | |
| 8 . | of an annual meeting? | |
| 9 | A. I know that I never received one. I | |
| 20 | would have to assume no | |
| 21 | Q. Okay. | |
| 22 | A to the rest. | |
| 23 | Q. Have you ever seen or are you in | |
| 24 | possession of minutes from a shareholders | |
| 25 | meeting? | |

| | | 26 |
|-----|---|----|
| 1 | A. No. | |
| 2 | Q. Did the company ever make | |
| 3 | distributions to its shareholders or any | |
| 4 | shareholder? | |
| 5 | A. There was no money to distribute. I | |
| 6 | know I personally never did. | |
| 7 | Q. Who all had you mentioned that | |
| 8 | the bank account, that you would do most | |
| 9 | things online. Who all had credentials to | |
| L 0 | sign on online to that bank account? Or was | |
| 1 | it just you? | |
| .2 | A. To my recollection, just me. | |
| _3 | Q. Mr. Slone asked you a question about | |
| 4 | your counsel, Mr. Roth, and whether or not | |
| 15 | you had paid him for this bankruptcy, and I | |
| 6 | believe your answer was no, and he asked if | |
| _7 | anyone had paid him and I believe your | |
| 8 ـ | answer is no. So is it your understanding | |
| _9 | as an officer of U Lock that Mr. Roth is | |
| 20 | handling this matter for free? | |
| 21 | A. I never thought about it. I would | |
| 22 | think I don't I don't know how that | |
| 23 | goes. I really don't know. I apologize. | |
| 24 | Q. Do you have any understanding of | |

whether or not he would be paid in the

| | | 27 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | future by U Lock or anyone else? | |
| 2 | A. I don't have any understanding of | |
| 3 | that either. | |
| 4 | MR. BURKLEY: Okay, I don't have | |
| 5 | any further questions. | |
| 6 | MR. KASH SNYDER: Thank you. | |
| 7 | MR. SLONE: Who, who else would | |
| 8 | wish to ask some questions at this time? | |
| 9 | MR. ZEBLEY: Mr. Slone, this is | |
| 10 | Zebley. Can I I was getting back on from | |
| 11 | the mute. Could I ask a couple questions? | |
| 12 | MR. SLONE: Yes, sir. | |
| 13 | EXAMINATION OF KASH SNYDER: | |
| 14 | BY MR. ZEBLEY | |
| 15 | Q. Okay. Mr. Snyder, I just want, this | |
| 16 | is really kind of a follow-up or a different | |
| 17 | variation of the questions you've just been | |
| 18 | asked; but who is getting paid to give legal | |
| 19 | advice in connection with the U Lock | |
| 20 | bankruptcy? | |
| 21 | A. To my knowledge nobody has received | |
| 22 | payment. | |
| 23 | Q. Who is going to get paid for giving | |
| 24 | legal advice in connection with the U Lock | |
| 25 | bankruptcy? | |
| | | |

| | | 28 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | A. From what I know, Attorney Roth will | |
| 2 | get paid if it's approved by the Court. | |
| 3 | Q. If what is approved by the Court? | |
| 4 | A. The payment to him. | |
| 5 | MR. ZEBLEY: What, Attorney Roth, | |
| 6 | can you shed light on that? | |
| 7 | MR. ROTH: Well, look, I believe | |
| 8 | it's their intention to pay me at some | |
| 9 | point, and so that's where we are; but I | |
| 10 | have not been paid anything to this point. | |
| 11 | Q. (BY MR. ZEBLEY) Back to you, Mr. | |
| 12 | Snyder. Is there an agreement with Attorney | |
| 13 | Roth regarding payment? | |
| 14 | A. None that I know of. | |
| 15 | Q. And this approval again is by the | |
| 16 | Court approving payment from U Lock assets? | |
| 17 | A. That's something I don't know. I | |
| 18 | think there's an hourly fee that is being | |
| 19 | requested from the Court or, you know, to be | |
| 20 | approved by the Court or something, and so I | |
| 21 | don't know about that. | |
| 22 | Q. Well, who does know about this? | |
| 23 | A. I don't know, but I know I can't pay | |
| 24 | and so | |
| 25 | Q. That wasn't my question. Who knows | |
| | | |

| | | 29 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | about the arrangement with Mr. Roth? | |
| 2 | A. (Inaudible) knows about the | |
| 3 | arrangement. The Bankruptcy Court. | |
| 4 | Q. Pardon? | |
| 5 | A. The Bankruptcy Court would know. | |
| 6 | Q. Well, Mr. Roth just isn't doing this | |
| 7 | on his own, is he? | |
| 8 | A. I believe he is. He's stuck in it, | |
| 9 | from what I gather. | |
| 10 | Q. And why is Mr. Roth stuck in this? | |
| 11 | A. It was because he was their | |
| 12 | attorney. That's something I don't know. | |
| 13 | Q. Who knows? | |
| 14 | A. I could give the phone to George | |
| 15 | Snyder. Maybe he does. | |
| 16 | MR. ZEBLEY: That's Mr. Slone, | |
| 17 | is that okay with you? | |
| 18 | MR. SLONE: Yeah, we'll swear, | |
| 19 | Mr Mr. Snyder, George Snyder, you were | |
| 20 | sworn in on 9/9/22 at the 341 Meeting. | |
| 21 | You're still under oath. Go ahead. | |
| 22 | MR. GEORGE SNYDER: Okay. I'm | |
| 23 | not sure | |
| 24 | EXAMINATION OF GEORGE SNYDER: | |
| 25 | BY MR. ZEBLEY | |

| | | 30 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | Q. Mr. Snyder, have you heard my | |
| 2 | questioning of this is Zebley have you | |
| 3 | heard my questions directed to Mr. Kash | |
| 4 | Snyder? | |
| 5 | A. Yes. | |
| 6 | Q. Who was authorized | |
| 7 | A. Yes, I heard your question. Pardon | |
| 8 | me? | |
| 9 | Q. Okay, you heard those questions. | |
| 10 | Can you shed some light on what | |
| 11 | A. I'm not sure how much more light I | |
| 12 | could shed on it. But I believe Mr. Roth | |
| 13 | filed notice with the Court, like his hourly | |
| 14 | fee. And we haven't paid him anything, and | |
| 15 | I just, it's my understanding that if he | |
| 16 | if the Court that we're not allowed to | |
| 17 | pay him anything. Everything has to go | |
| 18 | through the Bankruptcy Court. So it was my | |
| 19 | understanding that he would, if the Court | |
| 20 | approved it, then that's the only way he | |
| 21 | would get paid for these services during | |
| 22 | bankruptcy. | |
| 23 | Q. Is there an agreement with Mr. Roth? | |
| 24 | A. Well, I don't think we have a signed | |
| 25 | agrooment I think it!s just what the notice | |

| | | 31 |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | at Court maybe he filed. | |
| 2 | Q. Well, who's authorizing Mr. Roth to | |
| 3 | proceed? | |
| 4 | A. Well, I am. We don't have any other | |
| 5 | attorney and he's he's willing to do it. | |
| 6 | I don't know that he's stuck doing it like | |
| 7 | Kash said, but he he, you know, he filed | |
| 8 | his appearance in this case and he's our | |
| 9 | attorney, and so I authorized him to do | |
| 10 | whatever he's doing. | |
| 11 | Q. So your testimony is, Mr. Snyder, | |
| 12 | that any steps taken in this U Lock | |
| 13 | bankruptcy or the Shanni Snyder bankruptcy, | |
| 14 | you have authorized Mr. Roth to take? | |
| 15 | A. I didn't hear what you said about | |
| 16 | Shanni. | |
| 17 | Q. Well, do you (Inaudible) Shanni | |
| 18 | Snyder bankruptcy | |
| 19 | MR. JOYCE: John, John Joyce. I | |
| 20 | just got here. I was at a conference, so | |
| 21 | I've jumped in for Beth Slaby. Yeah, your | |
| 22 | last question brought up Ms. Snyder's | |
| 23 | bankruptcy, and there was no foundation or | |
| 24 | anything about Roth, I mean, unless Roth has | |

filed something for U Lock in that case --

| | | 32 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | Q. All right. | |
| 2 | MR. JOYCE: he's not involved. | |
| 3 | Q. Then drop Shanni Snyder from the | |
| 4 | question. | |
| 5 | A. Okay, I authorized what Mr Mr. | |
| 6 | Roth has done up and to this point, and he | |
| 7 | has to seek the money from the Court. | |
| 8 | Q. Everything that Mr. Roth has done? | |
| 9 | A. Yes. | |
| 10 | Q. And there is no writing that exists | |
| 11 | that memorializes an agreement between you | |
| 12 | and Mr. Roth, between U Lock and Mr. Roth? | |
| 13 | A. Yes, that he filed with the Court. | |
| 14 | It's on the docket, I believe. | |
| 15 | Q. Okay. And you'll get that docket | |
| 16 | number to everybody; correct? | |
| 17 | A. Yeah, I'll make a note of that if | |
| 18 | you'd like that. | |
| 19 | Q. Is there any other person that is | |
| 20 | giving legal advice in connection with this | |
| 21 | case to U | |
| 22 | A. No. | |
| 23 | Q to the U Lock shareholders? | |
| 24 | A. No. Just me. | |
| 25 | Q. Just Mr. Roth? | |
| | | |

| | 33 |
|--|----|
| A. Yes. I'm not sure if Christine or | |
| any of the other shareholders are, but just, | |
| I just know about me. I don't know about | |
| Christine or Mr. Otto. | |
| Q. And was the when Shanni Snyder | |
| filed her lawsuit, was that referred to | |
| anybody for legal advice? | |
| A. Well, I spoke with Mr I spoke | |
| with Mr. Roth about it, and it was, at that | |
| time I think he said it would be a \$10,000 | |
| case to defend. So I I didn't want to | |
| pay for that. | |
| Q. Mr. Roth wanted \$10,000 up front to | |
| defend it? | |
| A. I don't even think we got that far. | |
| We I discussed it and he says it would be | |
| a \$10,000 case. And he didn't he didn't | |
| necessarily say up front. | |
| Q. All right. The last question, and | |
| this may I may be repeating it a little | |
| bit and I apologize. | |
| A. Okay. | |
| Q. Under what circumstances will Mr. | |
| Roth get paid in connection with this case, | |

this bankruptcy?

| | | 34 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | A. It's my understanding that if the | |
| 2 | Court approves his hourly legal fee that is | |
| 3 | in the docket that I'll be sending you, if | |
| 4 | the Court approves it and if there's money, | |
| 5 | if U Lock has money, then I guess he could | |
| 6 | have to, you know, he'd have to ask the | |
| 7 | Court to pay him. If they don't, then I | |
| 8 | guess he would not get paid. | |
| 9 | Q. Where does your understanding come | |
| 10 | from? | |
| 11 | A. What do you mean? | |
| 12 | Q. Well, you say you have an | |
| 13 | understanding. You're not a lawyer. I'm | |
| 14 | just curious as to how you would | |
| 15 | A. Right, I mean | |
| 16 | Q come to that conclusion? | |
| 17 | A. Yeah, you're asking me like for | |
| 18 | legal advice, and I'm not a lawyer, so I'm | |
| 19 | really not sure, but that's my | |
| 20 | understanding. I just know | |
| 21 | Q. Why do you have that understanding? | |
| 22 | A. I just thought I knew he couldn't | |
| 23 | get paid without the Court approval, 'cause | |
| 24 | I was told by Mr. Slone and by the Judge | |
| 25 | that like I'm not you know, that sort of | |
| | | |

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

- Mr. Slone's in charge of everything. I can't take the money from U Lock and pay who I choose to pay. So it would be up to the Court, is what I thought.
- Q. Well, wouldn't Mr. -- wouldn't Mr. Roth be the appropriate person to tell you?
- A. Yeah, we -- we've talked about it, that's what I -- that's what I said earlier.

 I'm not sure if maybe I wasn't clear. But that, that's what me and Mr. Roth discussed.
- Q. Okay, and he has said that he will get paid out of the assets of U Lock?
- A. I'm not sure if this is -- Allen's here. You might want to ask him. I'm not sure if this is privileged between me and my attorney to tell you what we discussed and (Inaudible).
- Q. Well, actually this is U Lock. The privilege belongs to the Chapter 7 Trustee. So I don't think that's an appropriate objection.
- A. Okay, I mean, I think, I believe at one point Mr. Roth told me that he'd have to ask the Court for the -- for the money, and he said if the Court approves it, then, you

| | | 36 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | know, they get to decide all payments, and | |
| 2 | if they approve it, then he'll get paid. If | |
| 3 | they do not approve it, he won't get paid. | |
| 4 | So I don't really have any other research | |
| 5 | into that or knowledge of that other than | |
| 6 | kind of what Mr. Roth and I talked about or | |
| 7 | what I heard in court with the Judge. | |
| 8 | Q. Well, when did you and Mr. Roth talk | |
| 9 | about this? | |
| 10 | A. Over the past several months. | |
| 11 | Q. Before or after U Lock's bankruptcy | |
| 12 | started? | |
| 13 | A. Well, it would have been after. I | |
| 14 | would have had no knowledge of this. I | |
| 15 | would have had no knowledge of this | |
| 16 | bankruptcy until it came, so it would have | |
| 17 | been after. | |
| 18 | Q. And up till that point Mr. Roth was | |
| 19 | working for free? | |
| 20 | A. Well, the bankruptcy | |
| 21 | Q. No. | |
| 22 | A. The bankruptcy was involuntary, so | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | Q. You've been doing work before the | |
| 25 | bankruptcy? | |
| | | |

| | | 37 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | A. Oh, before the bankruptcy? | |
| 2 | Q. Yes, sir. | |
| 3 | A. Yeah, we we didn't pay him | |
| 4 | anything pre-bankruptcy. | |
| 5 | Q. Because he had agreed to work for | |
| 6 | free? | |
| 7 | A. No, it wasn't all free. I think he | |
| 8 | got paid during the in the beginning of | |
| 9 | the Biros litigation. I think that was | |
| 10 | prior to I don't know if that was 2017. | |
| 11 | 2000 I think it was around 2017. But | |
| 12 | then after that | |
| 13 | Q. What did | |
| 14 | A yeah, he didn't receive any | |
| 15 | payments. | |
| 16 | Q. What did you pay him in 2000 what | |
| 17 | did you pay him in 2017? | |
| 18 | A. I'm sorry? | |
| 19 | Q. What did you pay him in 2017? | |
| 20 | A. I think it was around \$5,000. I'd | |
| 21 | have to check. | |
| 22 | Q. And is there a writing memorializing | |
| 23 | the payment arrangement with Mr. Roth for | |
| 24 | the work he had done pre-bankruptcy? | |
| 25 | A. No. | |
| | | |

| | | 38 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | MR. ZEBLEY: All right, Mr. | |
| 2 | Slone, that's all the questions I have. | |
| 3 | MR. SLONE: Thank you. Who | |
| 4 | wishes to go next? | |
| 5 | MR. GEORGE SNYDER: Should I | |
| 6 | I'll hand the phone back to Kash. | |
| 7 | MR. SLONE: Okay. Anyone else | |
| 8 | wish to ask questions? Mr. Joyce, Mr. | |
| 9 | Kobeski? | |
| 10 | MR. JOYCE: No, Mr. Slone, we're | |
| 11 | we don't have any questions. | |
| 12 | MR. SLONE: Okay. If no one else | |
| 13 | has a question, we can close the meeting at | |
| 14 | this time. Thanks, everybody, for | |
| 15 | participating. | |
| 16 | MR. KASH SNYDER: Thank you all | |
| 17 | as well. | |
| 18 | MR. SLONE: Thank you, bye. (341 | |
| 19 | Meeting concluded.) | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | |

| | 39 |
|----|--|
| 1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | CERTIFICATE |
| 4 | |
| 5 | I, Mary J. Carney, a Court Reporter and Notary |
| 6 | Public in and for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, |
| 7 | do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and |
| 8 | correct transcription of the recorded proceedings of |
| 9 | the January 6, 2023, Continued 341 Meeting of |
| 10 | Creditors and constitutes a true record. |
| 11 | |
| 12 | This 17th day of January, 2023. |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | Notary Public |
| 16 | Notary rubite |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | |

| | | | | Tage 40 |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| A | approve 36:2,3 | 33:25 36:11,16 | <u>C</u> | 34:16 |
| - | approved 28:2,3 | 36:20,22,25 | | comes 14:9 |
| account 6:19 26:8 | 28:20 30:20 | 37:1 | C 39:3,3 | coming 5:25 |
| 26:10 | approves 34:2,4 | Bar 23:5 | Caesar's 23:5 | Commonwealth |
| accountant 9:5 | 35:25 | basically 24:23 | 24:10 | 39:6 |
| 10:1 | approving 28:16 | basis 16:14,17 | call 4:1 | company 6:9 |
| accurate 10:11 | approximately | beginning 6:7 | calling 24:19,20 | 14:6 21:5 23:24 |
| 10:13 | 10:9,10 | 19:16 37:8 | capacity 20:4 | 26:2 |
| add 11:22 | Arby's 23:1 | behalf 14:22 | car 14:6 | concluded 38:19 |
| advice 19:8 27:19 | arrangement | believe 6:10 7:9 | Carney 39:5 | conclusion 34:16 |
| 27:24 32:20 | 29:1,3 37:23 | 10:8 13:22 | case 4:2,3,5 14:15 | conference 31:20 |
| 33:7 34:18 | arrangements | 17:14,21,23 | 14:19,23 16:7 | connection 27:19 |
| ago 11:15 | 15:12 | 18:11,14 19:16 | 31:8,25 32:21 | 27:24 32:20 |
| agree 15:9 | asked 26:13,16 | 26:16,17 28:7 | 33:11,17,24 | 33:24 |
| agreed 15:11 | 27:18 | 29:8 30:12 | cause 21:9 34:23 | consider 23:19,19 |
| 37:5 | asking 34:17 | 32:14 35:22 | certificate 18:18 | consistent 10:15 |
| agreement 17:18 | asphalt 21:13 | belongs 35:19 | certificates 18:21 | constitutes 39:10 |
| 28:12 30:23,25 | assets 14:2 16:8 | best 6:13 19:21 | certify 39:7 | continued 1:13 |
| 32:11 | 28:16 35:12 | Beth 2:13 4:20,22 | chance 12:4 | 4:4 39:9 |
| ahead 9:8,10 17:5 | assume 25:20 | 31:21 | Chapter 1:3 4:18 35:19 | corporate 6:6,25 |
| 21:6 29:21 | attached 6:22 | better 22:1 | | corporation 7:16 |
| Allen 2:15 5:12 | attend 24:25 | big 7:25 | charge 35:1 | 8:1 9:4 10:3,16 |
| 12:15 Allen's 12:2 | 25:13 | Biros 2:11 5:2,3,5 | Charles 2:4 4:17 | 10:18 11:10 |
| | attorney 5:10 | 6:16,16 24:4 | check 37:21 | 12:21 18:25 |
| 35:13 | 28:1,5,12 29:12 | 37:9 | check-signing 20:16 | correct 5:6 8:13 |
| allowed 30:16 | 31:5,9 35:16 | Biroses 15:3 | choose 35:3 | 9:2,3 10:19 |
| ambiguous 19:20 amount 11:14 | authority 20:17 | bit 33:21 | Chris 11:8 | 12:21,22 13:13 |
| amount 11:14 amounts 18:16 | authorized 16:10 | Board 22:19 | Christine 2:11 | 18:10,12 19:18 |
| annual 25:13,18 | 30:6 31:9,14 | 23:20,25 24:17 | | 32:16 39:8 |
| annuar 23:13,18 answer 14:10 | 32:5 | 25:2 | 5:2,3 6:16 7:11 7:18 8:15 9:10 | counsel 26:14 |
| | authorizing 31:2 | boss 22:6,15,16 | 9:20 15:7,13,24 | couple 15:15 |
| 26:16,18 answered 10:1 | | bring 11:21 | 19:2,4,6,12 | 27:11 |
| anybody 14:14 | B | bringing 12:16 | 20:25 22:3,4 | course 9:12 14:3 |
| 19:11 33:7 | B 2:8,12 | brother 6:16 | 24:4 25:5 33:1 | court 1:1 14:18 |
| Anytime 10:13 | back 11:11 12:24 | brought 31:22 | 33:4 | 16:6 28:2,3,16 |
| apologize 19:22 | 13:1 14:6 27:10 | bunch 4:14 | Christine's 7:2 | 28:19,20 29:3,5 |
| 26:23 33:21 | 28:11 38:6 | Burkley 2:8 3:5 | circumstances | 30:13,16,18,19 |
| appeal 16:9,11,15 | bank 6:19 20:21 | 4:24,25,25 5:6 | 33:23 | 31:1 32:7,13 |
| 16:18,21 | 21:5 26:8,10 | 17:2,3,4,6,8 | Citizens 21:7 | 34:2,4,7,23 35:4 |
| appealing 16:10 | bankruptcy 1:1,2 | 27:4 | claim 16:1 | 35:24,25 36:7 |
| appearing 10.10 appearance 31:8 | 10:7 14:12,15 | business 8:17 | claimed 13:16 | 39:5 |
| appropriate 35:6 | 16:1 26:15 | 14:4 22:22 | cleaning 20:6 | credentials 26:9 |
| 35:20 | 27:20,25 29:3,5 | 25:11 | clear 5:25 35:9 | creditors 1:13 4:2 |
| approval 28:15 | 30:18,22 31:13 | bye 38:18 | close 38:13 | 4:4,5,14 12:14 |
| 34:23 | 31:13,18,23 | bylaws 17:12 | come 13:18 34:9 | 39:10 |
| JT.4J | <u> </u> | | Come 15.10 54.9 | <u> </u> |
| | | | | |

Page 40

| Page 4 | 4 | 1 |
|--------|---|---|
|--------|---|---|

| drop 32:3 | Federal 14:18 | 22:25 29:14,19 | harm 9:13 |
|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------|
| duties 20:1 21:8 | fee 16:21 28:18 | 29:22,24 38:5 | he'll 36:2 |
| 21:22 | 30:14 34:2 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | hear 4:13 5:20 |
| | felt 14:24 | | 31:15 |
| | figures 11:13 | getting 20:7,8 | heard 30:1,3,7,9 |
| | file 9:11,13 10:3 | 27:10,18 | 36:7 |
| | filed 14:17,20 | give 5:16 11:4 | held 4:6 |
| | 15:10,25 16:1 | 12:8 27:18 | help 8:11,18 |
| | 16:11 23:11 | 29:14 | helped 8:14 |
| | 30:13 31:1,7,25 | given 10:22 11:20 | helping 8:3 |
| | 32:13 33:6 | 12:14 | hire 9:17 |
| | filing 16:21 | giving 27:23 | honest 17:15 |
| = - | fine 7:3 15:5,5 | 32:20 | hourly 28:18 |
| | finished 21:9 | go 9:10 12:23 | 30:13 34:2 |
| | first 17:10 | 16:25 17:2,4 | hours 8:21 |
| - | fix 20:9 | 20:24 21:5 22:8 | house 22:8,9 |
| | fixed 20:10 | 23:1 29:21 | huge 21:14 |
| | fluff 23:3 | 30:17 38:4 | hush 25:5 |
| estate 13:7,8,21 | follow-up 27:16 | go-ahead 9:9,10 | hush- 25:4 |
| estimations 10:14 | foregoing 39:7 | goes 15:17 22:2 | |
| everybody 15:2 | forms 8:7 | 26:23 | I |
| 32:16 38:14 | found 22:3 23:12 | going 4:14 6:24 | iffy 17:15 |
| evidencing 18:21 | foundation 31:23 | 7:4 9:22 11:20 | Inaudible 22:11 |
| exact 11:13,16 | | | 29:2 31:17 |
| EXAMINATI | 17:24 | - | 35:17 |
| 3:4,5,6,7 6:2 | | | included 13:2 |
| 17:7 27:13 | | | 22:4 |
| 29:24 | | | INDEX 3:1 |
| excavating 22:9 | | O | individuals 19:9 |
| exception 23:7 | | | information |
| EXHIBITS 3:10 | | <u> </u> | 12:12,16 13:5 |
| exist 17:14 | | | insiders 10:21 |
| existed 18:3 | | | 11:3,23 |
| exists 17:21 32:10 | G | | installed 21:13 |
| | gap 13:25 | | intangible 16:8 |
| | garbage 20:7 | H | intention 28:8 |
| | gather 29:9 | H 2:3 | interim 4:7 |
| | George 2:7 3:7 | half 21:15 | INTRODUCED |
| | 5:7,9 6:16 7:19 | hand 5:15 11:18 | 3:10 |
| | 11:8,17,21 | 38:6 | invested 22:5 |
| 16:2,4,12,19 | 12:15 13:15,23 | handling 26:20 | investigation |
| family 25:7 | 15:4,5,24,25 | hands- 15:14 | 25:6 |
| far 15:16,16 | 16:13 19:2,4,6 | hands-on 21:25 | involuntary |
| 20:21,23 21:2 | 19:12,23 20:16 | happened 15:20 | 36:22 |
| 22:1,2 33:15 | 20:23 22:3,14 | happy 15:3 | involved 32:2 |
| | E E 39:3,3 earlier 35:8 either 19:7 27:3 electric 21:16 email 13:9 emailed 12:3 13:3 employees 8:1,2 8:17 ended 7:8 entered 16:6 Esquire 2:3,4,8,9 2:10,12,13,14 2:15 estate 13:7,8,21 estimations 10:14 everybody 15:2 32:16 38:14 evidencing 18:21 exact 11:13,16 EXAMINATI 3:4,5,6,7 6:2 17:7 27:13 29:24 excavating 22:9 exception 23:7 EXHIBITS 3:10 exist 17:14 existed 18:3 exists 17:21 32:10 F F 39:3 fact 18:9 21:21 fair 22:5,5 familiar 14:19,21 16:2,4,12,19 family 25:7 far 15:16,16 20:21,23 21:2 | Text | duties 20:1 21:8 |

| Page 4 | 2 |
|--------|---|
|--------|---|

| issue 18:24 19:9 | 15:21,22 16:14 | litigation 37:9 | 4:4,5 12:3,13 | 26:6,21 |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| issued 9:1 19:13 | 16:17,20,22 | little 33:20 | 21:2 24:7,18 | Notary 39:5,15 |
| items 11:21 | 17:16 18:6,6,20 | loans 11:4,11 | 25:3,14,18,25 | note 13:15 32:17 |
| | 18:23 19:2,6,7 | Lock 1:7 4:3,5 | 29:20 38:13,19 | notes 24:2,5,23 |
| J | 19:10,20 20:3,8 | 5:11 6:5 9:9 | 39:9 | notice 25:16 |
| J 2:14,15 39:5 | 20:9 21:10,12 | 11:4,4,12 12:24 | meetings 22:20 | 30:13,25 |
| January 1:14 | 22:4,8,12 23:2,3 | 13:1 14:11,23 | 23:5,20,24 24:1 | notices 25:1,3 |
| 39:9,12 | 24:7 25:5,16,19 | 16:7 17:12,18 | 24:10 | notifying 25:1,17 |
| Jeremy 2:14 4:21 | 26:6,22,23 28:1 | 18:10 19:13 | memorializes | number 8:23,24 |
| 4:23 | 28:14,17,19,21 | 22:8 23:7 24:14 | 32:11 | 19:13 32:16 |
| John 2:12 6:16 | 28:22,23,23 | 26:19 27:1,19 | memorializing | numbers 10:10 |
| 7:18 11:8 14:5 | 29:5,12 31:6,7 | 27:24 28:16 | 37:22 | |
| 19:2,12 20:11 | 33:3,3 34:6,20 | 31:12,25 32:12 | mentioned 26:7 | 0 |
| 21:3 22:2,14,15 | 34:25 36:1 | 32:23 34:5 35:2 | met 23:13 | O 2:4 |
| 22:24 24:7 | 37:10 | 35:12,18 | million 18:15,16 | oath 29:21 |
| 31:19,19 | knowledge 7:20 | Lock's 36:11 | 18:25 19:9 | objection 35:21 |
| Joyce 2:12 31:19 | 12:24 14:5 15:2 | Lock-related | millions 18:14 | officer 6:7 7:5 |
| 31:19 32:2 38:8 | 27:21 36:5,14 | 22:23 | mind 14:9 | 19:16 20:2 |
| 38:10 | 36:15 | long-term 8:4 | minor 7:19 | 26:19 |
| Jr 2:4 | knows 28:25 29:2 | look 12:4 13:17 | minutes 23:23,25 | officers 6:12,17 |
| Judge 34:24 36:7 | 29:13 | 28:7 | 24:16,20,21 | 10:21 11:3 |
| July 6:10 | Kobeski 2:14 | looking 13:19 | 25:24 | official 6:24 8:4 |
| jumped 22:6,10 | 4:23 38:9 | loss 9:14 10:19 | missed 23:9 | 20:3 22:17 |
| 31:21 | Kubota 12:18,19 | lot 7:21 18:16 | money 10:25 11:4 | Oh 18:14 21:5,7 |
| K | 12:20 | 20:14 | 11:8,22 12:23 | 24:4 37:1 |
| Kash 2:6 3:4,5,6 | | <u>M</u> | 13:6 15:2,13,14 | okay 4:12,20,24 5:10,13,21 6:1,4 |
| 4:9,9,11 5:13,18 | $\frac{\mathbf{L}}{\mathbf{L} 2:13}$ | machine 8:17 | 15:22 26:5 32:7 | 6:8,11 7:7 9:1 |
| 5:22 6:1,2 17:7 | label 23:21 24:22 | machines 22:10 | 34:4,5 35:2,24 | 9:25 11:6 12:1 |
| 27:6,13 30:3 | labeled 25:15 | maintenance | month 10:14 | 12:6,23 13:4,9 |
| 31:7 38:6,16 | lawsuit 9:22 | 21:12,25 | months 36:10 | 13:14,22 14:1 |
| keep 8:20 23:23 | 14:17 15:10 | majority 7:22 | morning 13:12 | 14:11 15:7,8 |
| 23:24 24:2,5 | 23:11 33:6 | making 15:1 | mute 27:11 | 16:23 17:4 |
| kept 25:8 | lawyer 34:13,18 | Mary 39:5 | N | 20:20 21:7 |
| kind 27:16 36:6 | leave 22:7 | matter 5:16 | name 4:15 6:22 | 24:15 25:21 |
| Kirk 2:8 4:25 | legal 27:18,24 | 26:20 | named 7:9 | 27:4,15 29:17 |
| 17:3 | 32:20 33:7 34:2 | mean 6:18 7:11 | names 9:11 | 29:22 30:9 32:5 |
| knew 34:22 | 34:18 | 9:15 12:13 | napkins 24:8 | 32:15 33:22 |
| know 7:1,5,8,13 | life 10:16 | 13:11 15:3,5,17 | necessarily 33:18 | 35:11,22 38:7 |
| 7:21,22,24,25 | light 28:6 30:10 | 20:5 21:15 22:5 | need 12:16 13:4,4 | 38:12 |
| 8:18,19,19,22 | 30:11 | 22:10 24:19 | 13:7,16,20 | once 22:4 24:5 |
| 9:17 10:2,25 | limited 8:21 | 25:9 31:24 | needed 20:10 | online 20:22 26:9 |
| 11:12,13,16 | lined 20:5 | 34:11,15 35:22 | needs 21:11 | 26:10 |
| 12:8 14:20,24 | list 11:21 12:14 | meet 20:24 22:22 | never 8:2,3,8,9 | operated 10:19 |
| 15:6,7,16,19,19 | 24:24 | meeting 1:13 4:2 | 9:1 15:22 25:19 | operating 9:14 |
| | | | | • |
| | | | | |

CONT 341 MEETING OF CREDITORS - 1/17/2023

| Page 4 | 3 | |
|--------|---|--|
|--------|---|--|

| 1. 16.610 | 1 | l | 1 , , , , , | 1 |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| order 16:6,10 | people 8:3,6,11 | quarterbacked | remember 6:15 | scheduled 4:8 |
| ordinary 14:3 | 8:16,22 11:11 | 20:6 | 6:21 7:11 | schedules 10:7 |
| original 4:5 | percent 21:1,1 | question 9:25 | repaid 11:14 | see 16:3 |
| Otto 2:10 5:1 | percentages | 13:5 17:11,20 | repeating 33:20 | seek 32:7 |
| 33:4 | 17:25 | 18:5 26:13 | Reporter 39:5 | seen 17:11,17 |
| outside 19:8 | person 32:19 | 28:25 30:7 | requested 12:13 | 19:24,25 25:23 |
| owed 10:25 | 35:6 | 31:22 32:4 | 28:19 | send 11:17 13:25 |
| owned 12:20 14:7 | personally 7:14 | 33:19 38:13 | research 36:4 | sending 34:3 |
| owners 6:17 | 17:11,17 26:6 | questioning 30:2 | responsibilities | sent 12:15 13:10 |
| ownership 18:22 | phone 11:18 | questions 11:17 | 21:22 | 13:11 24:17 |
| P | 29:14 38:6 | 16:25 17:10 | rest 25:22 | 25:1,17 |
| PAGE 3:4,5,6,7 | place 11:1 | 23:17 27:5,8,11 | restaurants 24:8 | September 4:6 |
| paid 8:12 11:23 | please 5:14 16:16 | 27:17 30:3,9 | returns 10:4 | services 30:21 |
| 13:8 15:1 16:20 | point 16:25 28:9 | 38:2,8,11 | revenue 10:8 | set 22:1 |
| 26:15,17,25 | 28:10 32:6 35:23 36:18 | quiet 25:8 | rid 20:7,8 | Shanni 2:5 4:18 |
| 27:18,23 28:2 | | quit 23:10 | right 5:14,22 | 4:23 14:17 |
| 28:10 30:14,21 | portion 21:14 positive 8:23 | R | 11:19 17:20,23 18:8 23:23 32:1 | 15:17 31:13,16 31:17 32:3 33:5 |
| 33:24 34:8,23 | - | R 39:3 | | share 18:17 |
| 35:12 36:2,3 | possession 18:4 24:16 25:24 | raise 5:14 | 33:19 34:15 38:1 | share 18:17 shareholder 7:23 |
| 37:8 | | re-sent 13:23 | roads 21:13 | 17:18 18:9 26:4 |
| paralegal 12:2 | pre-bankruptcy 37:4,24 | real 13:7,8,21 | Robert 2:3 4:6 | shareholders |
| Pardon 29:4 30:7 | present 2:1 4:10 | really 7:2,13 15:6 | roles 7:6 | 7:15,20 10:22 |
| part 7:25 | 4:11,14 5:4,8,9 | 22:3 26:23 | Roth 2:15 5:12 | 18:20 25:14,17 |
| participate 14:23 | president 7:9 | 27:16 34:19 | 5:12 12:15 | 25:24 26:3 |
| participating | 19:17 | 36:4 | 14:12,14 26:14 | 32:23 33:2 |
| 38:15 | previously 18:8 | reason 8:20 | 26:19 28:1,5,7 | shares 18:1,13,16 |
| parties 16:24 | prior 37:10 | receipt 13:16,19 | 28:13 29:1,6,10 | 18:18,25 19:9 |
| pay 8:16 11:10,10 | privilege 35:19 | 13:20 | 30:12,23 31:2 | 19:13 |
| 13:6 14:14 | privileged 35:15 | receive 37:14 | 31:14,24,24 | shed 28:6 30:10 |
| 15:12 20:10,12 | probably 20:25 | received 18:17,21 | 32:6,8,12,12,25 | 30:12 |
| 28:8,23 30:17 | 21:25 | 19:8 25:19 | 33:9,13,24 35:6 | show 11:24 13:7 |
| 33:12 34:7 35:2 | proceed 31:3 | 27:21 | 35:10,23 36:6,8 | 13:20 |
| 35:3 37:3,16,17 | proceedings 1:12 | recollection 6:13 | 36:18 37:23 | shows 12:8 |
| 37:19 | 39:8 | 6:19 17:13 | running 25:10 | sign 19:25 26:10 |
| payment 13:20 | promissory 13:15 | 26:12 | | signed 7:14 13:15 |
| 15:10 27:22 | property 20:7 | record 4:15 39:10 | S | 19:20 30:24 |
| 28:4,13,16 | 21:14,15,16 | recorded 1:12 | salary 10:23 | simple 8:21 |
| 37:23 | 25:11 | 39:8 | sale 16:8 | sir 8:10 27:12 |
| payments 10:22 | Public 39:6,15 | recycle 20:9 | sales 14:2 | 37:2 |
| 14:11 36:1 | pull 9:20 | referred 33:6 | Sarah 2:9 5:1 | situation 14:25 |
| 37:15 | put 4:15 9:11 | regarding 28:13 | saw 22:25 | skill 22:1 |
| penalty 9:18 | 11:8 | regular 21:11,11 | saying 10:18 | Slaby 2:13 4:22 |
| Pennsylvania 1:1 | | relationship 6:5 | says 13:14 33:16 | 4:22 31:21 |
| 39:6 | Q | relying 9:20 | schedule 16:4 | Slone 2:3 3:4 4:1 |
| | | l | l | I |
| | | | | |

CONT 341 MEETING OF CREDITORS - 1/17/2023

| Page | 44 | |
|------|----|--|
| | | |

| 4:6,12,20,24 5:3 | strong 5:25 | 18:15 19:1,5 | 16:7 17:12,18 | we're 11:19 30:16 |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------|
| 5:7,10,13,19,24 | structure 6:25 | 20:18,18,22 | 18:9 19:13 22:8 | 38:10 |
| 6:3 16:23 17:4 | stuck 29:8,10 | 23:12 25:6 | 22:23 23:6 | we've 35:7 |
| 26:13 27:7,9,12 | 31:6 | 26:22 28:18 | 24:13 26:19 | Wednesday |
| 29:16,18 34:24 | stuff 12:10 13:11 | 30:24,25 33:10 | | 22:24 23:8 |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | * | 27:1,19,24 | |
| 38:2,3,7,10,12 38:18 | 20:22 21:11 | 33:15 35:20,22 | 28:16 31:12,25 | Wednesdays |
| | sure 25:7 29:23 | 37:7,9,11,20 | 32:12,21,23 | 22:21 |
| Slone's 35:1 | 30:11 33:1 | thought 7:11 | 34:5 35:2,12,18 | weekly 21:2 23:4 |
| Snyder 2:5,6,7 | 34:19 35:9,13 | 9:18 15:22 18:2 | 36:11 | 24:9 |
| 3:4,5,6,7 4:9,9 | 35:15 | 26:21 34:22 | unclear 7:13 | Wenrich 2:9 5:1 |
| 4:11,19,23 5:7,9 | swear 5:15 29:18 | 35:4 | understand 24:21 | went 12:25 13:1 |
| 5:14,14,18,19 | sworn 29:20 | thousand 10:14 | understanding | 22:18 |
| 5:22 6:1,2,4 | T | three 19:3 | 26:18,24 27:2 | weren't 8:12 |
| 11:21 12:15 | : | till 9:21 36:18 | 30:15,19 34:1,9 | WESTERN 1:1 |
| 13:15 14:17 | T 39:3,3 | time 4:4 7:12 9:7 | 34:13,20,21 | William 2:10 5:1 |
| 17:7,9 23:14,16 | take 31:14 35:2 | 9:7,12 11:1,1 | understood 15:23 | willing 31:5 |
| 27:6,13,15 | taken 16:9 31:12 | 21:1 22:24 | unfortunately | wish 27:8 38:8 |
| 28:12 29:15,19 | talk 19:11 36:8 | 23:10 27:8 | 13:1 | wishes 38:4 |
| 29:19,22,24 | talked 9:6 17:25 | 33:10 38:14 | United 1:1 2:3 | work 14:14 15:4 |
| 30:1,4 31:11,13 | 23:6 35:7 36:6 | times 24:5 | V | 20:6 21:16,19 |
| 31:18 32:3 33:5 | tangible 16:8 | to- 24:23 | | 36:24 37:5,24 |
| 38:5,16 | tax 10:4 13:16,17 | today 17:10 | variation 27:17 | worked 6:6 20:4 |
| Snyder's 31:22 | taxes 13:7,8,21 | told 9:12,16 | vice 7:9,12 19:17 | workers 8:6 |
| sold 12:18,19 | tell 35:6,16 | 34:24 35:23 | volunteering | 20:11,12 |
| 14:6 | tenants 20:13 | tractor 14:7 | 15:21 | working 20:23 |
| sorry 11:15 21:3 | testified 18:8,12 | TRANSCRIPT | W | 36:19 |
| 21:6 23:18 24:4 | 19:15 | 1:12 | $\frac{\mathbf{W-2's} 9:1}{\mathbf{W-2's} 9:1}$ | wouldn't 35:5,5 |
| 37:18 | testimony 4:9 | transcription | | writing 6:15,22 |
| sort 7:1 9:23 | 5:15 11:19 | 39:8 | wage 16:1 | 32:10 37:22 |
| 19:19 20:5,23 | 19:19 31:11 | treading 7:1 | wages 14:18 | written 17:12 |
| 22:6 24:22 25:4 | Thank 17:6 27:6 | trigger 9:21 | wait 9:21,23 | 25:3 |
| 25:8,10 34:25 | 38:3,16,18 | true 39:7,10 | waiting 25:11 | wrong 6:14 18:1 |
| speak 4:13 5:20 | Thanks 38:14 | Trustee 2:3,4 4:7 | want 11:24 27:15 | wrote 6:18,20 |
| specifically 4:8 | they'd 23:1 | 4:18 35:19 | 33:11 35:14 | • |
| specifics 13:2 | thing 6:21 23:2 | truth 5:17 6:21 | wanted 33:13 | X |
| speculating 18:7 | things 6:18 7:14 | Turtle 23:5 | wants 16:25 | Y |
| split 7:5,5 | 8:21 9:11 11:16 | two 11:15 23:9 | wasn't 14:6 15:20 | |
| spoke 33:8,8 | 15:8,8 18:1 | typical 24:7 | 24:6,6 28:25 | yeah 8:14 12:4 |
| start 6:9 12:16 | 19:21 20:8,10 | typically 23:1 | 35:9 37:7 | 22:21 23:18,21 |
| started 6:19 | 20:24 24:8,9,13 | | water 7:1 | 29:18 31:21 |
| 36:12 | 25:8 26:9 | <u>U</u> | way 19:25 22:18 | 32:17 34:17 |
| starting 4:16 | think 6:20 7:4 | U 1:7 4:3,5 5:11 | 24:22 25:15 | 35:7 37:3,14 |
| States 1:1 2:3 | 8:22 9:7,8 | 6:5 9:9 11:4,4 | 30:20 | year 8:24 10:8 |
| stay 23:16 | 10:12,24 11:16 | 11:12 12:24 | we'll 11:22 13:25 | 11:14 |
| steps 31:12 | 14:8,9,9 15:18 | 13:1 14:11,22 | 29:18 | years 7:2 11:9,15 |
| | | l | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |
| | | | | |

CONT 341 MEETING OF CREDITORS - 1/17/2023

| | | | Page 4 |
|---|--|--|--------|
| 11:24 15:15 21:18 23:9 Zebley 2:4 3:6,7 4:16,16,17,18 27:9,10,14 28:5 28:11 29:16,25 30:2 38:1 zero 9:18,19 0 110,000 33:10,13 33:17 100 18:15,24 19:9 21:1 1099 8:6,7 1099's 9:2 12,000 10:10 12/20/22 16:7 13,000 10:9,9 16 3:5 17th 39:12 2000 37:11,16 2015 6:10 2017 37:10,11,17 37:19 2020 10:7,9 | 4 18:15 45,000 12:19 5 5 3:4 5,000 37:20 6 6 1:14 39:9 600 8:16,24 7 7 1:3 4:18 35:19 8 9 9 4:6 9/19 12:13 9/9/22 29:20 90 20:25 99,000 16:1 | | Page 4 |
| 12/20/22 16:7 13,000 10:9,9 16 3:5 17th 39:12 2 2000 37:11,16 2015 6:10 2017 37:10,11,17 37:19 2020 10:7,9 | | | |
| 2021 10:7 12:18 12:19 2022 4:6 2023 1:14 39:9,12 22-20823-GLT 1:2 4:3 25 3:6 27 3:7 3 341 1:13 29:20 38:18 39:9 | | | |
| 4 | | | |

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

| In re: U LOCK INC. a/k/a |) | |
|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| U-LOCK INC. |) | Bankruptcy 22-20823-GLT |
| |) | |
| Debtor. |) | Chapter 7 |
| |) | |
| |) | |

DECLARATION OF GEORGE SNYDER

I, George Snyder, declare and state under the penalty for perjury that the following is true and correct (28 USC 1746):

- 1. My name is George Snyder. I am an officer of U Lock Inc.
- 2. I am making this declaration in response to Trustee Robert Slone's request for 1099 or W-2 records of employees and independent contractors.
- 3. U Lock had persons that did do work for the Company since 2015 through 2022.
- 4. No 1099s were filed because they did not receive cash compensation in excess of \$550. John Biros told us the way he handled pay for people who helped with his machines was to keep cash payments under the reporting requirements and that he'd like to keep it similar to that. Christine Biros stated the same thing similar, but it was primarily John insisting to be careful about having to file things. The cash payments under \$550 per year were people who helped with the landscape, construction, maintenance, painting, electrical, errands. I do not know if, whether it was formally calculated, what they actually received from U Lock amounts to minimum wage. Hopefully it was near minimum wage, but I cannot be certain. I had some notes and books, flashdrives, in the trailer at U Lock in file box, but I could not access due to the lockout by Christine Biros. When I finally obtained access to that trailer in January 2023, before it was demolished, the file box was not there. Therefore, I can only go by memory. I recall some of the workers from 2015 to 2022 were Nicole Delancey, Ray Weishorn, Amber Leddon, Ray Weishorn, Angelica Weishorn, Tristan Weishorn, Kyle Wishorn, Kathy Gribshaw, Karley Gribshaw, Gina Gribshaw, none earning more than \$550 per year but the exact amounts are in the records which disappeared from the trailer. There may be some other people whose names I cannot present recall.
- 5. At first we would provide workers with food, often from the pizza shop in White Oak controlled by the Biros family. Sometimes food would be given from Sheetz or McDonalds, etc. We did not consider the food compensation where we issued a 1099 for giving them that. Sometimes John Biros paid, sometimes we used U Lock rent money, or I loaned money for the food.
- 6. To the extent these workers did not receive minimum wage, I am unclear on what is required, but they never stated they were owed more so I did not list them as creditors. I still do not fully understand what is required under the

- Labor Laws, who is an employee, and how to determine that since they were paid so little.
- 7. Our executive employees such as John Biros, Kash Snyder, and myself, we did not take money for salary, all hoping to advance the company until Robert Biros interfered and made Christine Biros file suit. I understand we were due minimum wage for our work because even executives are entitled to that, but we did not pay it because the company had very little revenue. I would not consider Christine Biros an employee since she just participated in Board meetings at her bar on a weekly basis. She was more like a Director or officer, but not actually working on site. Per the instruction of Christine Biros and John Biros, at the weekly meetings from 2015 through 2018, salary to cover the work would come once we rented to tenants. John Biros had almost daily meetings from 2015 to 2018, he worked on site sometimes, he brought some of his personal effects and stored them there, and he was an executive, and Kash Snyder worked for the company, along with me. Kash worked on site and offsite, but he did not receive income for the same reasons.
- 8. John Biros provided the Company pickup truck until 2020 when he said he needed it. John and I would obtain supplies, shelving, and things in the truck. I did not list the truck on the schedules because I think he might have kept the title in his name.
- 9. People who helped out, and whatnot, and people like Shanni Snyder who helped with security and cameras, were not salaried employees receiving cash. Because they received no cash or compensation, we did not issue a W-2. If we eventually have to pay them, or if we can pay them, we would issue a 1099 at that time. But we cannot issue a 1099 because we can't pay.
- 10. For these reasons, I cannot provide 1099s or W-2s. Dated this 12th day of February 2023.

1st Sectae Inyder

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

| Bankruptcy No. 22-20823 |
|---|
| Chapter 7 |
| Related Doc. No.: |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| OF COURT |
| y of, 2023, upon consideration |
| UMBER 5 FILED BY GEORGE SNYDER (the |
| Claim is DISALLOWED and EXPUNGED. |
| |
| |
| |
| Hon. Gregory L. Taddonio United States Chief Bankruptcy Judge |
| , |

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

| IN RE: | Bankruptcy No. 22-20823 |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| U LOCK INC, | Chapter 7 |
| Debtor. | |
| | Related Doc. No.: |
| CHRISTINE BIROS, | |
| Movant, | |
| V. | |
| GEORGE SNYDER, | |
| Respondent. | |

NOTICE OF HEARING AND RESPONSE DEADLINE REGARDING OBJECTION TO CLAIM NUMBER 5 FILED BY GEORGE SNYDER

TO THE RESPONDENT(S):

You are hereby notified that the Movant seeks an order affecting your rights or property.

You are further instructed to file with the Clerk and serve upon the undersigned attorney for Movant a response to the Motion by no later than March 27, 2023 (i.e., thirty (30) days after the date of service below), in accordance with the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, the Local Rules of this Court, and the general procedures of the presiding judge as found on the Court's webpage at www.pawb.uscourts.gov. If you fail to timely file and serve a written response, an order granting the relief requested in the Motion may be entered and the hearing may not be held. Please refer to the calendar posted on the Court's webpage to verify if a default order was signed or if the hearing will go forward as scheduled.

You should take this Notice and the Motion to a lawyer at once.

An in-person hearing will be held on <u>April 13, 2023</u>,, at <u>10:30 a.m.</u> before Judge Gregory L. Taddonio in Courtroom A, 54th Floor U.S. Steel Tower, 600 Grant Street, Pittsburgh, PA, 15219. In accordance with Judge Taddonio's procedures, parties may appear for non-evidentiary matters remotely by utilizing the Zoom video conference platform. Parties seeking to appear remotely must register for the hearing by submitting a registration form

via the link published on Judge Taddonio's website (which can be found at http://www.pawb.uscourts.gov/judge-taddonios-video-conference-hearing-information) by no later than 4 p.m. on the business day prior to the scheduled hearing. All parties participating remotely shall comply with Judge Taddonio's *General Procedures*, (which can be found at http://www.pawb.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/pdfs/glt-proc.pdf).

Parties who fail to timely register for remote participation will be expected to attend the hearing in person.

Only a limited time of ten (10) minutes is being provided on the calendar. No witnesses will be heard. If there is an issue of fact, an evidentiary hearing will be scheduled by the Court for a later date.

Date of Service: February 24, 2023

BERNSTEIN-BURKLEY, P.C.

By: /s/Robert S. Bernstein

Robert S. Bernstein (PA ID No. 34308) Lara S. Martin (PA ID No. 307272) 601 Grant Street, Floor 9

Pittsburgh, PA 15219 Telephone: (412) 456-8100 Facsimile: (412) 456-8135 rbernstein@bernsteinlaw.com

lmartin@bernsteinlaw.com

Counsel for Christine Biros

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

| IN RE: | Bankruptcy No. 22-20823 |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| U LOCK INC, | Chapter 7 |
| Debtor. | |
| CHRISTINE BIROS, | Related Doc. No.: |
| Movant, | |
| v. | |
| GEORGE SNYDER, | |
| Respondent. | |

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OF THE OBJECTION TO CLAIM NUMBER 5 FILED BY GEORGE SNYDER AND THE NOTICE OF HEARING AND RESPONSE DEADLINE REGARDING OBJECTION TO CLAIM NUMBER 5 FILED BY GEORGE SNYDER

I certify under penalty of perjury that I served the above captioned pleading on the parties at the addresses specified below or on the attached list on February 24, 2023.

The type(s) of service made on the parties (first-class mail, electronic notification, hand delivery, or another type of service) was: first-class mail, electronic notification.

If more than one method of service was employed, this certificate of service groups the parties by the type of service. For example, the names and addresses of parties served by electronic notice will be listed under the heading "Service by Electronic Notification," and those served by mail will be listed under the heading "Service by First-Class Mail."

SERVICE BY FIRST CLASS MAIL

| U LOCK INC | J. Allen Roth |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 14140 U.S. Route 30 | 805 S Alexandria Street |
| N. Huntingdon, PA 15642 | Latrobe, PA 15650 |

| Shanni Snyder | David L. Fuchs |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 14390 Route 30 | Fuchs Law Office, LLC |
| Unit H | 554 Washington Ave., First Floor |
| North Huntingdon, PA 15642 | Carnegie, PA 15106 |
| | |
| Robert H. Slone, Trustee | Office of the United States Trustee |
| 223 South Maple Avenue | Liberty Center. |
| Greensburg, PA 15601 | 1001 Liberty Avenue, Suite 970 |
| | Pittsburgh, PA 15222 |

Dated: February 24, 2023 BERNSTEIN-BURKLEY, P.C.

By: /s/ Robert S. Bernstein

Robert S. Bernstein (PA ID No. 34308) Lara S. Martin (PA ID No. 307272) 601 Grant Street, Floor 9

Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Telephone: (412) 456-8100
Facsimile: (412) 456-8135
rbernstein@bernsteinlaw.com
lmartin@bernsteinlaw.com

Counsel for Christine Biros

3/26/2023 12:03 PM CLERK U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT - WDPA

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

| In re: U LOCK INC. a/k/a |) | |
|--------------------------|------|--------------------|
| U-LOCK INC. |) | Case. 22-20823-GLT |
| |) | |
| Debt | tor. | |
| |) | RE Motion at 337 |

GEORGE SNYDER'S RESPONSE OPPOSING THE OBJECTION TO MY CLAIM

I am an officer of the debtor U Lock. I file this response to the objection in my personal capacity as a creditor who filed the proof of claim.

Biros attaches one declaration I provided, but forgot to attach the Declaration I gave to the Trustee on or around September 7 2022. I have attached it hereto. The trustee emailed asking for more information about my claim so I provided the Declaration. The Trustee gives Ms. Biros everything I give him, so I am not sure why they forgot it. The Trustee didn't ask for more. The Declaration about the employees was about the request for W2s and 1099s that don't exist, explaining why, which I gave to the Trustee at his request and he gave it to Biros.

Anyway as this Court knows, I worked for U Lock, or I guess Christine Biros if she is right that she owned the business at all times, since 2015 and received nothing to compensate myself. It is true I didn't list myself as an employee when I did the schedules for U Lock. From the company's perspective, I was an officer. But I also performed actual labor there, maintenance, cleanup, supervising contractors, administering, customer service, everything, meeting with John Biros practically every day from 2015 to 2018, meeting with Christine Biros weekly to give status updates, all of that is work.

From my personal perspective, I filed a proof of claim by the claim's deadline giving everyone notice of my claim. I thought that was the procedure. I didn't know I had to amend and amend every time a claim was filed. I can file amended schedules for U Lock and list all

these claims that were lodged including the Biros claims of the specious environmental damage, the shanni claim, and my claim. Certainly the IRS I think I listed them on the

I filed this claim for wage after researching this Shanni Snyder claims and how vast and broad the FLSA was, I believe it covers me even though I was an officer and owner. There were over 1000 shareholders I didn't list them all on the schedules because this court didn't convert the case to Chapter 11. I understand I don't have to give a shareholder list in a Chapter 7. I can upload one. Also John Biros was partner, he had daily meetings with me form 2015 to 2018, then even after that meetings up until 2019. Christine Biros had weekly meetings with me, even after she filed her lawsuit, still had meetings about the plan moving forward. So it's just not the shareholders here that were on paper, this was supposed to be a partnership.

Regardless I think my claim should be sustained, I think I am entitled to at least minimum wage or the minimum executive compensation. I did a lot of work. I incorporate my declaration attached and the declaration that Biros did file.

I declare under penalty for perjury that the above is true and correct.

Dearge Dryle

This March 26, 2023.

original schedules.

George Snyder PO Box 15

Irwin PA 15642

412-979-9999

DECLARATION OF GEORGE SNYDER

FILED 3/28/2023 12:03 PM CLERK U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT - WDPA

I, George Snyder, declare and state under the penalty of perjury that the following is true and correct:

- 1. My name is George Snyder.
- From July 2015 to the present, I acted as executive of U Lock Inc. and/or, pursuant to Christine Biros' theory, her constructive trust. I believe that U Lock Inc. owes the minimum wage and, if Christine Biros is correct in her legal theories that U Lock is a constructive trust for her, then she jointly owes the wage.
- 3. I did not perform only executive duties at U Lock, I also performed labor. Specifically, my duties entailed: Management of the enterprise, weekly meetings with the Biros family (John and Christine) through June 2018, renting units, collection of rents, check mail daily, cut grass and whack weeds weekly, spray round up monthly, remove trees and overgrowth, remove snow, plow snow, salt roads, graded parking area, put down millings, graded access road in back to upper level, cleaned up tires and scrap that had been dumped, met routinely with customers, cleaned out units when a person left, fixed and secured electrical service (guide wire for mast), fixed leaks in roof, lubricated and adjusted doors, met with and administered highways projects, moved around heavy machinery, cleanup, replaced rotting wood framing, put gravel down in both aisles, general management, monitor trespass incidents, deal with lawsuit issues, prepare documents, and many other tasks.
- I filed a proof of claim alleging that U Lock owed me \$99,999 for wage. This
 is because I did not receive compensation from U Lock or Christine Biros in
 any way.
- 5. The Fair Labor Standards Act requires that most employees in the United States be paid at least the federal minimum wage for all hours worked and overtime wage at not less than time and one-half the regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours in a workweek.
- 6. However, Section 13(a)(1) of the FLSA provides an exemption from both minimum wage and overtime pay for employees employed as bona fide executive, administrative, professional and outside sales employees. Section 13(a)(1) and Section 13(a)(17) also exempt certain computer employees. These exemptions are often called the "white-collar" or "EAP" exemptions.

- 7. To qualify for exemption, employees generally must meet certain tests regarding their job duties and be paid on a salary basis at not less than \$684 per week. Job titles do not determine exempt status. In order for an exemption to apply, an employee's specific job duties and salary must meet all the requirements of the Department's regulations.
- 8. I did not receive a salary of at least \$684 per week. In fact, due to U Lock's insolvency since its inception, I received no salary whatsoever.
- 9. I worked approximately 5 days per week. From July 10, 2015, until April 26, 2022, when the bankruptcy was filed, there were 2,481 days. I worked approximately 5 days per week. Excluding weekends, there were 1,771 days, totalling approximated 7,084 hours of unpaid work.
- 10. The calculations I used are as follows;

July 2015

16 days included

Su M Tu W Th Fri Sa n on e ed u t

| 1) 11 | | | America | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|----------|----|--------------------|-------------|-------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
| 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
| 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | |
| 1 | 1. | ec. on gunctive in | 2 (4 4 4 5) | . 0.0 | P. C. C. C. STATE STATE | The same of the same |

August 2015

21 days included

Su M Tu W Th Fri Sa n on e ed u t

| | | 1x; | | | | 1 |
|----|----|-----|-------------|----|----|-------|
| 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |
| 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 |
| 30 | 31 | | 2(2) (1) | | | 7. jo |

September 2015-March 2022

September 2015–December 2015: 88 days included

Year 2016: 261 days included

Year 2017: 260 days included

Year 2018: 261 days included

Year 2019: 261 days included

Year 2020: 262 days included

Year 2021: 261 days included

January 2022–March 2022: 64 days included

April 2022

16 days included

Su M Tu W Th Fri Sa n on e ed u t

| 8 | 9 |
|----|----|
| | |
| 15 | 16 |
| 22 | 23 |
| | |

- 12. While I did not *per se* "take off" weekends, I used this calendar for calculation purposes because there were some days I did not work.
- 13. I worked approximately 4 to 5 hours average per day or more dealing with U Lock Inc. or under Christine Biros' theory, her trust including monitoring and maintaining the property, cutting the grass, providing customer service, dealing with the legal proceedings, paying its bills, collecting from tenants, etc.Excluding weekends, there were 1,771 days, totalling approximately 7,084 hours of unpaid work. At minimum wage, that would entitle me to \$51,359.compensation from U Lock (or Christine Biros under her theory).
- 14. Moreover, under the FLSA, apparently I would be owed liquidated damages of the same amount because U Lock and, under Christine Biros' theory, the her trust, so I doubled the amount in my proof of claim.
- 15. These are extremely low estimates of the time and hours I put in.
- 16. Alternatively, if it is found that I am a salaried executive, I would be entitled to \$684 per week, which well exceeds the \$99,999 claim I submitted.

George Snyder

RESOLUTION OF U LOCK INC.

At a meeting of the shareholders on June 30, 2022, in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania:

WHEREAS, Shanni Snyder commenced an involuntary bankruptcy under Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Court which, because of a lack of defense to the allegation of insolvency, it did not answer, and as the Corporation is insolvent and unable to pay its debts when due,

and WHEREAS, the Corporation and its creditors would best be served by reorganization of the Corporation under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, Subchapter V, Small Business Recorganization, considering that benefit to the creditors and the Company would be best had by invoking the Pennsylvania Uniform Voidable Transactions Act or similar avoidance and preferential transfer laws available under the bankruptcy code and federal law to void the purported involuntary transfer of U Lock's property, obtain available financing, and pay the creditors in full, it is hereby:

RESOLVED, that the Corporation authorizes as soon as practicable counsel J Allen Roth to convert the case to reorganization pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, Subchapter V, Small Business Reorganization. The Corporation consents to reorganization.

Present: George Snyder 345,000,000 outstanding shares

Kash Snyder 75,000,000 outstanding shares (telephonically)

Quorum: 98.82% of shareholders voting for resolution. 1.18% not present.

The undersigned hereby certifies that he is the custodian of the books and records of U Lock Inc., a corporation duly formed pursuant to the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and that the foregoing is a true record of a resolution duly adopted at a meeting of the shareholders with a quorum present exceeding 98.82% of the outstanding share of U Lock's stock and that said resolution is now in full force and effect without modification or rescission.

George Snyder

Majority shareholder

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA CIVIL ACTION LAW

| CHRISTINE BIROS |) |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Plaintiff |) |
| vs |) No. 4886 of 2017 |
| DENISE SCHUR, Executrix of the ESTATE |) |
| OF ALEX SCHUR, HENRY L. MOORE |) |
| and SUSAN STANO, Co-Executors of the |) |
| ESTATE OF NICHOLAS SCHUR, |) |
| KATHLEEN S. WALTER, Executor of the |) |
| ESTATE OF MICHAEL SCHUR, |) |
| CYNTHIA SARRIS, Administrator of the |) |
| ESTATE OF ANN SARRIS and U LOCK INC., | j |
| a Pennsylvania corporation, |) |
| Defendants | Ď |

TYPE OF PLEADING:

Defendant U Lock Inc.'S Amended Objections
And Responses To The Interrogatories, Requests
For Admissions, And Request For Production Of Documents

FILED ON BEHALF OF:

J. Allen Roth, Esquire

COUNSEL OF RECORD:

J. Allen Roth, Esquire PA I.D.# 30347 757 Lloyd Avenue Suite B Latrobe, PA 15650 724-537-0939



IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CHRISTINE BIROS,

CIVIL DIVISION

Plaintiff,

No. 17 CI 04886

VS.

DENISE SCHUR, et al,

Defendants.

DEFENDANT U LOCK INC.'S AMENDED OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO THE INTERROGATORIES, REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS, AND REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

Defendant U Lock Inc., by and through its undersigned counsel, submits the following objections and responses to the discovery requests propounded by Plaintiff:

INITIAL OBJECTIONS:

U Lock incorporates by reference all of its objections contained in the original discovery responses and provides these amended responses in accordance with the directive of the Court.

INTERROGATORIES

1. Identify all current and former officers and directors of U Lock. Provide the dates during which each held office and the address of the current residence of such:

Kash Snyder -- mid 2014 to present, 670 Lime Street, North Huntingdon, PA 15642

George Snyder, 14140 Route 30, North Huntingdon, PA 15642 - mid 2014 to present

Erik Martin Mid 2014 to present 218 Maryland Avenue, North Versailles, PA 15137

Chelsea Hauser acted as special Vice President with respect to the buy and sell of a dump trailer.

EXHIBIT "A&O"

2. Identify all current and former shareholders of U Lock. Provide the dates during which each held shares, the number of shares and the consideration paid for such shares. Provide the address of the current residence of each.

See the attached list of shareholders and transactions.

3. Identify all current and former employees of U Lock. Provide the dates during which each was employed, their job title, responsibility and the total compensation paid to each during his or her employment. Provide the address of the current residence of each.

U Lock states that it does not maintain "employees" and did not maintain "employees" in the past. U Lock operates through officers, volunteers, and contractors.

4. Identify all customers, tenants and licensees of U Lock. Provide the dates of for which each was a customer, tenant or licensee, and the amount of consideration paid by each to U Lock.

This request was withdrawn by the Plaintiff pursuant to the Court Order.

5. Identify all real estate owned or leased by U Lock.

U Lock states the property that is the subject this action is the only real estate owned by U Lock.

EXHIBIT "X"

6. Identify each individual and entity to whom or which U Lock has made any payment, the aggregate amount and the reason for which such sum was paid.

U Lock produces records of the transactions herewith.

EXHIBITS "E,F,G,H,I, W"

7. Provide a description of any and all improvements made by or for U Lock to the Property. Identify each person or entity which performed the improvements. Provide copies of each written contract and evidence of payment to such person or entity.

U Lock refers to the receipts and documents attached by reference, many of which are expenses incurred improvement or repairing the property.

9/3/15 repaired roof on big buildings. Estimated costs \$1800.

9/23/15 graded and graveled big garage floor left side. Emptied and cleaned garage to prepare the ground for gravel. Estimated costs \$2500.

12/12/16 \$2,400 garage door opener.

11/18/15 tree removal between hotel and u lock. Clean up and then to burn brush

11/15/15 graded area by hotel, install 10 triaxels of clean fill.

12/12/15 renovated big garage right side same as other side

12/15/15 graded and graveled floor garage right side.

8/15/17 excavated road rear of property, 2 machines, excavator and trackloader used.

9/3/15 repaired roof on big buildings

EXHIBIT "J"

8. Identify all financial institutions which currently hold or formerly held accounts of U Lock, account numbers, and copies of each bank statement prepared by such financial institution since such account was opened.

U Lock maintains an account with Citizens Bank. U Lock agrees to make copies of the bank statements available for inspection and copying.

EXHIBIT "K"

9. Identify the individual named Erik Martin who is listed as a "debtor" on that certain UCC-1 filed in the Office of the Secretary of State of Pennsylvania and identified as UCC Filing No. 2016081700035. Describe the legal and financial relationship between U Lock and Erik Martin, and any payments made to Erik Martin by or on behalf of U Lock concerning this transaction.

Defendant does not have a copy of the UCC form to positively identify the transaction. However, it is believed that Erik Martin would be the same Erik Martin discussed in paragraph 1, above. Furthermore, it is believed, without seeing the form, that it relates to an excavator. U Lock pays the amount for the machine each month, which is used for work on the property that the subject of this litigation.

EXHIBIT "A,B,C&O"

10. Describe in detail the terms of any alleged loan or agreement to repay Plaintiff, including the amount borrowed, the interest rate, the term of the loan, the periodic payment amounts and any security for the loan or agreement. Provide a copy of any written documentation of such loan or agreement.

Subject to this answer being supplemented upon Plaintiff providing the agreement that she created and demanded be signed, along with further investigation and discovery, U Lock provides this answer to the interrogatory based on available information, recollection, and memory. This response is meant to provide the best information available.

After locating a property to purchase, a confederation of individuals primarily including George and Kash Snyder negotiated with John Biros, not Plaintiff. George and Kash Snyder advised Biros that they were in the process of forming an entity to purchase the property, continuing the U Lock storage business, and ultimately developing the property into something more lucrative. In discussions with John Biros, Mr. Biros agreed to provide U Lock with the funds to purchase the property. It was understood and verbally agreed between John Biros and George and Kash Snyder that Mr. Biros would receive a share of the equity, approximately 35-40%, and that George and Kash would be tasked with maintaining operations, development, etc. As the closing date approached, Mr. Biros continued to represent that the funds would be available and that an agreement could be worked out. Subsequently, John Biros advised the Snyders that, for "family" reasons and to maintain the appearance that Christine Biros was the source of family income, the money must come from Plaintiff, not him, and that subsequent to the transaction the equity of the company in the form of the issuance of shares could be issued to him or that an agreement could be made to pay the money back at current interest rates. The time period for repayment was discussed but not specifically agreed upon. In some conversations, a 5 year balloon payment with monthly interest payments was mentioned, a 10 year balloon payment with monthly interest payments was mentioned, and a conventional 20 or 30 year mortgage was mentioned.

On the date of the closing, specifically while driving to the closing event for the property with Kash Snyder in the vehicle, Plaintiff expressed that she had a concern that nothing was in writing. Plaintiff demanded that a document be signed by Kash Snyder. Plaintiff provided a document she created and handwrote and insisted Kash Snyder signed it. Kash Snyder, faced

with the prospect of the funds not being provided, signed the paper. It is unknown if Kash Snyder signed the document in his personal capacity, as incorporator for U Lock Inc., or as an officer of U Lock Inc. The terms are unknown to U Lock.

Over the past couple years, Plaintiff and her brother John Biros repeatedly saw the officers of U Lock, Kash and George Snyder. At no time did either of the Biros' demand the money back, interest payments, or the equitable interest that was discussed or planned.

In mid-2017, Plaintiff propounded a demand letter acknowledging that the payment made in 2015 was a loan. The letter referenced the agreement signed in 2015. The letter demanded that officers of U Lock personally guarantee the 2015 loan, be paid in full no later than 2022, and that interest be at 9%. Subsequent to service the demand, Plaintiff and John Biros advised George Snyder that the terms were negotiable. Several discussions took place in the second and third quarter of 2017 where Plaintiff and John Biros verbally stated to disregard the letter, that no repayment needed to occur, and that instead they wanted to become equity owners (shareholders) in U Lock as originally agreed because they believed the property was undervalued and they wanted to be part of the development.

In late 2017 or early 2018, Plaintiff and John Biros advised that their father wanted to take the property and that they were being forced by him to sue. Plaintiff and John Biros repeatedly advised that because "dad" decided they wanted to develop the property, they had to try to take it. Plaintiff and John Biros stated that they would try to discuss the matter with "their dad" or that they would attempt to ignore their father.

At no time prior to filing the lawsuit did Robert Biros, John Biros, or Plaintiff claim they owned the property, ask U Lock, George Snyder, or Kash Snyder for an accounting, or claim any wrongdoing or dispute about the issue. Rather, the only communication was the 2017 letter admitting that the transaction constituted a loan.

As to any "security" for the loan, U Lock has no information to believe that there was any security provided for the loan. Even the letter demand did not mention any pre-existing security interest in the property in exchange for the loan, but demanded that a mortgage be issued to Plaintiff along with personal guarantees. However, without seeing the original letter, U Lock cannot positively state what the document states.

Of course, even if the document pledged the property, U Lock does not believe that the paper Plaintiff demanded Kash Snyder sign constitutes a security interest in the property that is valid under the statute of frauds, or codes and statutes of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Therefore, the Plaintiff does not maintain a security interest in U Lock's property.

EXHIBIT "A&O"

11. Describe any consideration or investment, including money, property or services, paid or provided to or for U Lock by any of the current or former executors or administrators of the Defendant Estates.

Aside from the sale of the property to U Lock Inc. pursuant to the terms and conditions in the purchase agreement and the deeds, the non-U Lock defendants provided an assignment of leases was provided to U Lock Inc. and transfer of title in certain storage containers. Upon the execution of a protective Order, non-disclosure agreement, and limited use agreement, U Lock agrees to provide said documents to Plaintiff. Additionally, a short term loan was provided with U Lock pledging the property. U Lock agrees to provide copies of the loan documents.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS

1. U Lock has not submitted any written applications for borrowing funds from financial institution which would be secured by a mortgage on the Property.

As of the date of this response, admit.

2. U Lock has not submitted any written applications for borrowing funds from any lender which would be secured by a mortgage on the Property.

As of the date of this response, admit as qualified: Because Plaintiff has not disclosed the documents signed by Kash Snyder, it is unclear if the document signed by Kash Snyder constituted a mortgage or is secured by the property. Defendant reserves the right to supplement this response as soon as Plaintiff discloses a copy of the document.

EXHIBITS "B &C"

3. U Lock has not filed any federal, state, or local tax returns.

Denied as stated. Pursuant to multiple verbal requests of John Biros and Plaintiff, U Lock delayed filing the IRS 1120 form and state returns because Mr. Biros persuaded George Snyder, controlling shareholder of U Lock that: (1) It would not owe taxes and operated at a loss during 2015, 2016, and 2017, so a late filing would not result in penalties; (2) Accurate information needed to be compiled with respect to whether Biros would be listed as a partner or a lender; and (3) John Biros and Plaintiff asked George Snyder, majority shareholder in U Lock, to delay filing said returns because it was important that no filing occur until the Attorney General of Pennsylvania completed its investigation of the family's gambling business. U Lock will be submitting returns to the IRS and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Revenue by the end of 2018. Those returns will be provided to counsel for U Lock in accordance with the Court's directive.

EXHIBIT "E"

4. U Lock does not have a Federal Employee Identification Number.

Denied. U Lock attaches its FEIN. **EXHIBIT "D"**

5. U Lock has made no payments of tax to any income taxing authority.

Denied as stated. U Lock has not made a profit that would warrant payment of "income tax." U Lock has made payments to the Township of North Huntingdon.

EXHIBIT "Q"

6. U Lock has no intention of repaying Plaintiff for the funds she paid for the Property.

Denied. Plaintiff refused to provide a copy of the contract signed on July 15, 2015, for determination as to whether the corporation is liable pursuant to said agreement or if only Kash Snyder is liable. Plaintiff sent the demand letter, which U Lock has filed with the Court. This demand letter, however, does not provide a copy of the original agreement. U Lock cannot determine if it is legally obligated to pay the loan made by plaintiff to Kash Snyder, what the terms of the loan are, and whether said loan is secured, unsecured, or owed by U Lock or just Kash Snyder. In the event that it is determined that U Lock must pay the loan, and not only Kash Snyder, U Lock will comply with said obligation pursuant to the terms of that written instrument.

7. U Lock has neither applied for nor received any permits to store motorized equipment on the Property.

Based on information, property owners maintain the ability to store their equipment in spaces on property that they own or lease without the need for a permit. U Lock possesses a North Huntingdon general business license and has disclosed a copy. U Lock is not operating as a salvage yard and is not engaged in the business of salvaging vehicles. If Plaintiff is aware of a necessary permit, she should advise U Lock so it may take corrective action.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

1. Provide copies of all U Lock's federal, state, and local tax returns for tax years 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018.

As stated above, U Lock is preparing to file the returns by the end of the 2018. At this

time, it could not locate any responsive records. U Lock incorporates its response to the request for admissions by reference as if fully set forth again.

EXHIBIT "D &E"

- 2. Provide a copy of U Lock's Bylaws and any amendments to such Bylaws.
 - U Lock agrees to provide any copies of Bylaws or Amendments to Bylaws that it locates.

 EXHIBIT "Y"
- 3. Provide copies of all corporate minutes for U Lock.

U Lock agrees to provide any corporate minutes that it locates after a diligent search.

4. Provide copies of all issued share certificates for U Lock.

U Lock would not possess share certificates. The shareholders would. Rather, U Lock maintains a share ledger that it has provided in connection with this discovery request. U Lock will update the ledger throughout this litigation.

EXHIBIT "R"

5. Provide a copy of the stock ledger for U Lock.

See response to document request 4, above.

EXHIBIT "R"

6. Provide copies of any and all lease(s) to which U Lock is or was a party.

Leases for customers has been withdrawn. U Lock agrees to disclose any leases that it locates after a diligent search.

- 7. Provide copies of any and all stock purchase agreement(s) to which U Lock is or was a party.
- U Lock agrees to disclose any share purchase agreements in its possession after a diligent search.

EXHIBIT "R"

8. Provide copies of any and all agreement(s) to purchase and/or sell assets to which U Lock is or was a party.

EXHIBIT "S,T,U,V"

9. Provide copies of all financial statements prepared for U Lock.

U Lock did not prepare financial statements as of this time.

10. Provide copies of each and every application for financing applied for by U Lock.

Financing applications are maintained by lenders, not by U Lock. U Lock ordinarily would not receive the application copy. However, U Lock agrees to conduct a diligent search and disclose and provide any application for financing.

EXHIBIT "I"

11. Provide copies of U Lock's subchapter S election, if such election was made.

U Lock did not elect to be a subchapter S corporation.

12. Provide copies of U Lock's Federal EIN application.

U Lock did not retain its EIN application because it is a digital online form. U Lock did not submit a paper form. U Lock agrees to provide the EIN number and related documents.

EXHIBIT "D"

13. Provide copies of all written documentation evidencing a loan from Plaintiff to U Lock.

Defendant does not maintain evidence of the 2015 document created by Plaintiff. Interrogatory #10's answer and objection is incorporated by reference. The only copy of the document, which Plaintiff propounded immediately prior to the close and insisted Kash Snyder sign, was retained by the Plaintiff. In mid-2017, Plaintiff propounded a letter asking U Lock to sign an agreement stating that the loan was for 10 years at 9% interest. The letter admits the existence of the 2015 document, but does not attach it. The demand letter provided to U Lock Inc. has been previously produced and served on Plaintiff's counsel. U Lock agrees to provide

the 2017 letter again if needed by Plaintiff. The letter makes it clear that the money was not paid for the property, but was a loan.

EXHIBIT "A&O"

14. Provide a copy of any advertisements which were placed to comply with Section 1307 of the Pennsylvania Associations Code, 15 Pa.C.S. 1307.

Defendant agrees to produce all advertisements located after a diligent search.

EXHIBIT "L"

15. Provide copies of each contract to which U Lock is or was a party for which U Lock provided services in excess of \$500.00 over the term of the contract.

Plaintiff withdrew the request for customer information.

16. Provide copies of each contract to which U Lock is or was a party for which U Lock received services in excess of \$500.00 over the term of the contract.

Defendant agrees to produce all relevant documents located after a diligent search.

17. Provide copies of all documents concerning the lease or purchase by U Lock of equipment from Kubota.

U Lock agrees to produce the documents in its possession and located after a reasonable search. U Lock notes that the majority of the documents would be maintained and constitute business records of Kubota, not U Lock.

EXHIBIT "I &G"

18. Provide copies of each and every policy of insurance on U Lock, the Property and U Lock's employees.

Defendant agrees to produce all documents relevant to this request located after a diligent search.

EXHIBIT "F"

19. Provide copies of each and every document necessary to provide a full and complete response to the matters set forth above in [the] Interrogatories and [the[Request for Admissions.

Defendant agrees to produce all documents relevant to this request located after a diligent search.

20. Provide copies of each and every document or exhibit U Lock intends to present at trial.

Defendant agrees to produce all documents relevant to this request located after a diligent search. Defendant notes discovery is continuing and additional documents will be disclosed as they are located or received.

EXHIBITS "A,M,N,O,P"

Respectfully submitted,

J. Allen Roth, Esquire

Counsel for Defendant, U Lock, Inc.

VERIFICATION

AND NOW, comes, GEORGE SNYDER on behalf of U LOCK INC., who verifies that the facts contained in the foregoing Defendant U Lock Inc.'s Amended Objections And Responses To The Interrogatories, Requests For Admissions, And Request For Production Of Documents are true and correct upon her own knowledge, information and belief. This Verification is made subject to the penalties of 18 PA. C.S. Section 4904 relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.

9/28/10

DATE

GEORGE SNYDER on behalf of U LOCK INC.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA CIVIL ACTION LAW

| CHRISTINE BIROS |) |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Plaintiff |) |
| VS |) No. 4886 of 2017 |
| DENISE SCHUR, Executrix of the ESTATE |) |
| OF ALEX SCHUR, HENRY L. MOORE |) |
| and SUSAN STANO, Co-Executors of the |) |
| ESTATE OF NICHOLAS SCHUR, |) |
| KATHLEEN S. WALTER, Executor of the |) |
| ESTATE OF MICHAEL SCHUR, |) |
| CYNTHIA SARRIS, Administrator of the |) |
| ESTATE OF ANN SARRIS and U LOCK INC., |) |
| a Pennsylvania corporation, |) |
| Defendants |) |

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I will forward a copy of the Defendant, U LOCK INC.'S Response to Production Of Documents and Interrogatories by U.S. first class mail prepaid and hand delivery to the following:

William E. Otto, Esquire
P.O. Box 701
Murrysville, Pa 15668
(Counsel for Plaintiff, Christine Biros)

William F. Ross, Esquire Ross & Storck, Ltd. 406 N. Market Street Wooster, OH 44691 (Counsel for Defendant, Denise Schur)

John Tumolo, Esquire
Suite 1500 Frick Building
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219
(Counsel for Defendant, Kathleen S. Walter)

Dennis Del Cotto, Esquire 4345 Old William Penn Highway Murrysville, Pa 15668

(Counsel for Defendants, Henry L. Moore, Susan Stano and Cynthia Sarris)

10-1-18

Date

./Allen Roth, Esquire

Attorney for Defendant U Lock, Inc.

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE: . Case No. 22-20823-GLT

•

U LOCK INC, 5414 U.S. Steel Tower

600 Grant Street

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Debtor. .

April 13, 2023

.... 1:30 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF #294 CONTINUED ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE SIGNED ON 1/17/2023. (RE: RELATED DOCUMENT(S): 258 APPLICATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES; #278 CONTINUED AMENDED ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE SIGNED ON 1/6/2023. (RE: RELATED DOCUMENTS(S): 249 ORDER SCHEDULING HEARING); #345 CONSENT MOTION TO APPROVE COMPROMISE UNDER RULE 9019; #340 OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF SHANNI SNYDER; AT CLAIM NUMBER 1; #337 OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF GEORGE SNYDER; AT CLAIM NUMBER 5; #344 AMENDED APPLICATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES PURSUANT TO 11 U.S.C. 503(b)(1) AND/OR FOR PAYMENT OF ADEQUATE PROTECTION

BEFORE HONORABLE GREGORY L. TADDONIO UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Debtor: Law Office of J. Allen Roth

By: J. ALLEN ROTH, ESQ. 805 S. Alexandria Street

Latrobe, PA 15650

For George Snyder: By: GEORGE SNYDER, PRO SE

Box 15

Irwin, PA 15642

ECRO: Hayley Smith

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. 268 Evergreen Avenue Hamilton, New Jersey 08619 E-mail: jjcourt@jjcourt.com

(609) 586-2311 Fax No. (609) 587-3599

BIROS_APPENDIX_0211 EXHIBIT F APPEARANCES (Cont'd):

For Christine Biros: Bernstein-Burkley, P.C.

> By: ROBERT S. BERNSTEIN, ESQ.

2

MARK LINDSAY, ESQ.

601 Grant Street, 9th Floor

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

For Christine Biros,

Lead Counsel in the State Court Action: The Law Firm of William E. Otto

By: WILLIAM E. OTTO, ESQ. 4027 Old William Penn Highway

P.O. Box 701

Murrysville, PA 15668

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES:

Chapter 7 Trustee: Mahady & Mahady

> By: ROBERT H. SLONE, ESQ. 223 South Maple Avenue Greensburg, PA 15601

For Shanni Snyder: The Lynch Law Group LLC

By: JOHN PATRICK LACHER, ESQ.

501 Smith Drive, Suite 3 Cranberry Twp, PA 16066

| 1 | ECRO: Court may now come to order. The Honorable |
|-----|---|
| 2 | Gregory L. Taddonio presiding. |
| 3 | THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, everyone. |
| 4 | This is the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Western |
| 5 | District of Pennsylvania and this is the Court's docket of |
| 6 | Chapter 7 and Chapter 11 matters on this Thursday, April 13, |
| 7 | 2023. The matter under consideration at this time is Case |
| 8 | Number 22-20823, U LOCK INC. I'll begin by taking appearances |
| 9 | first here in the courtroom and I'll start over here. Mr. |
| 1.0 | Roth? |
| 11 | MR. ROTH: Alan Roth on behalf of U LOCK. |
| 12 | THE COURT: All right, good afternoon. |
| 13 | MR. SNYDER: George Snyder. |
| 14 | THE COURT: All right, good afternoon. Want to come |
| 15 | over here? |
| 16 | MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, on behalf of Christine |
| 17 | Biros, Robert Bernstein, Bernstein-Burkley. |
| 18 | THE COURT: Okay. |
| 19 | MR. BERNSTEIN: William Otto sitting next to me. |
| 20 | THE COURT: All right, good afternoon. |
| 21 | MR. BERNSTEIN: Ms. Biros is in the courtroom next to |
| 22 | him and my colleague Mark Lindsay. |
| 23 | MR. LINDSAY: Good afternoon. |
| 24 | THE COURT: All right, good afternoon, everyone. All |

WWW.JJCOURT.COM

24

1 right, that satisfies the appearances here in the courtroom and 2 \parallel then I'll take appearances on the Zoom call. I'll start first 3 with the Chapter 7 Trustee.

MR. SLONE: Yes. Robert Slone, Chapter 7 Trustee, Your Honor.

4

5

6

7

8

11

14

15

17

18

THE COURT: All right, good afternoon. And, I'll take an appearance for Shanni Snyder?

MR. LACHER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. John Lacher on behalf of Shanni Snyder, and Shanni Snyder is in the room 10 with me, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, good afternoon. All right, and is 12 there anyone else who wishes to enter an appearance in this 13 case?

(No audible response)

THE COURT: All right. This is a hearing set on several pending matters and I have -- the Claims Objections filed by Christine Biros to the claims of George Snyder and Shanni Snyder. I have an Amended Application for Payment of Administrative Expenses, including Post-Petition Rent, relatedly a Consent Motion to Approve Compromise under Rule 9019, and then two continuations of hearings related to Orders 22∥ to Show Cause that were issued by the Court at Docket Numbers 278 and 294. Unless there's any housekeeping matters that I 24 need to be aware of, I am just going forward in starting with 25 the claims objections, so any preliminary comments from the

WWW.JJCOURT.COM

parties that we need to address?

1

2

3

10

11

17

20

22

23

(No audible response)

THE COURT: All right, hearing none. I'd like to $4\parallel$ begin with the Christine Biros' objection to the claim of $5\parallel$ George Snyder, which is Claim Number 5, and since this seemed to help us with some efficiencies in the hearing, I'm going to just go through some of my observations of what the parties have argued at this point and just ask if there's additional clarification or other remarks that anyone wants to add?

So, I have Claim Number 5-1 that was filed by George Snyder in the amount of \$99,000 as an unsecured claim or, quote, wage, Fair Labor Standards, end quote. There was no supporting documentation attached to the claim, but it was timely filed. Ms. Biros has filed an objection indicating that Mr. Snyder signed the schedules without listing a wage claim and should be judicially estopped from doing so now, and at the 341 meeting, Mr. Snyder allegedly testified that, quote, the \$99,000 is what Biros would owe me, end quote, because he never 19 received officer compensation for the last seven years.

Ms. Biros asserts that the Fair Labor Standards Act does not apply to these claims because, one, Snyder is not an employee of the Debtor and testified the Debtor has no employees. The FLSA carves out establishments whose only regular employees are the owner and immediate family members, so Snyder is not entitled to a minimum wage.

| In addition there is no evidence that Snyder was a |
|---|
| contractor for U LOCK, and even if he could assert a claim, the |
| statute of limitations is two years, not seven. Mr. Snyder has |
| filed a response, indicating that he worked for Biros, and if |
| she is correct and owned the business at all times since 2015, |
| he filed the claim after researching Shanni's FLSA claim. He |
| also cites to Section 13(a)(1) and 13(a)(17) of the FLSA, which |
| provides exemptions from Section 206 regarding minimum wage |
| requirements for employees in a bona fide executive, |
| administrative, or professional capacity, and certain skilled |
| computer workers, and the declaration provides as calculation, |
| assuming he worked four to five hours a day five days a week. |
| Mr. Snyder also asserts he doubled the amount of his actual |
| claim as liquidated damages. |

So, that's the context of how I understand the claim objection and I'll ask the parties if there's anything in addition that they wish to add separate and apart from what's 18 already in the papers. Mr. Bernstein?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Assuming that Your Honor was 20 highlighting what was in the papers and not making an 21 exhaustive recitation, we have nothing else to add to what was 22 in our objection.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Snyder, 24 anything else you want to add?

MR. SNYDER: Not much. You covered mostly

everything. I just wanted to add the one thing that Mr. Slone 1 2 3 MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, I'm sorry. Could we -- $4 \parallel$ because Mr. Snyder is representing himself, is it possible that 5 he be sworn for these assertions so that we have a clear 6 record? 7 THE COURT: I don't have any issue with that. 8 Snyder, you understand what we're going to do is we're going to put you under oath and so any statements that you give are 10 going to be your sworn testimony in this matter? 11 MR. SNYDER: Yes, I do. 12 THE COURT: Okay. If you can please rise and raise 13 your right hand and I'll ask the court reporter to please swear 14 you in. 15 GEORGE SNYDER, WITNESS, SWORN 16 17

ECRO: Thank you, and if you can please speak clearly into the microphone. Thank you.

18

19

23

24

MR. SNYDER: Okay, yeah. I noticed I did that.

The only other thing I wanted to add throughout this 20 whole process, right after we handed in the schedules, I was also going to -- Mr. Slone and I were talking about amending the schedules, so I could have amended that part as well. I just thought I'd mention that.

THE COURT: Okay. But, nothing further at this 25 point?

MR. SNYDER: No.

1

2

7

11

14

17

18

20

21

24

THE COURT: All right. Well, upon review of the papers and review of the claim, I'm going to make the following Number one, as noted before, the claim is just a findings. 5 bare bones claim. It does not have any supporting documentation substantiating the amounts claimed, or breakdown of the time periods, or the time frames by which the wages were accrued, and so under the Allegheny International line of cases that followed from the Third Circuit decision there, I find that it's not entitled to prima facie validity. And in addition to that, I do think that there are valid points that have been raised by Christine Biros with respect to deficiencies in the claim.

First off, under applicable law, 29 U.S.C.A. Section 203(s)(2), provides, quote, any establishment that has as its only regular employees, the owner thereof, or the parent, spouse, child, or other member of the immediate family of such owner, shall not be considered to be an enterprise engaged in commerce, or in the production of goods for commerce, or a part of such an enterprise, end quote.

Relatedly, Section 29 U.S.C.A., Section 206 provides, quote, every employer shall pay to each of his employees, who in any work week is engaged in commerce, or in the production of goods for commerce, or is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce, or in the production of goods for commerce, wages,

at the following rates, end quote.

1

2

3

7

8

11

14

15

17

18

20

23

24

Here, the Court is finding that this did not constitute -- U LOCK did not constitute an entity or an 4 enterprise engaged in commerce, since he was -- George Snyder $5\parallel$ was the owner, U LOCK had no other employees, and consequently George does not appear to be an employee as qualified under the FLSA.

I also note that the statute does provide under 29 U.S.C., Section 255(a), that there is a two year statute of 10 | limitations except that an action arising from a willful violation may be commenced within three years. Here, the allegation is that some of these claims may reach as far back from 2015 to at least 2019 and, therefore, would seemingly be time barred.

I also note that the response that was given does seem to have some inconsistencies. I'm not sure exactly why Mr. Snyder is claiming exemptions under the FLSA, because the exemptions would not be helpful to him and, in fact, would 19 \parallel exclude U LOCK or his status from coverage for wages.

It also appears to me that Claim 5-1 appears to be an attempt to recoup lost sweat equity or capital contributions that were provided through his labor and efforts, rather than a wage.

And, finally, and also compelling, is that the claim 25 does conflict with sworn statements that were given elsewhere

6

7

8

11

14

17

18

20

22

1 in this case, particularly with respect to the schedules and $2 \parallel$ testimony at the 341 meeting and in other sworn declarations. So, for all those reasons, I find that the objection is well-4 founded and I will sustain the objection and deny Mr. Snyder's claim.

So, that brings us forward to the next claim objection which is the objection to Claim Number 1 filed by Shanni Snyder. This was a claim filed in the amount of \$263,100, originally as a secured judgment. Ms. Biros has filed an objection, asserting that Shanni was not an employee of U LOCK, and as is supported by Shanni's schedules, and given her failure to properly schedule a wage claim, Shanni should be judicially estopped from asserting one now.

Both George and Kash Snyder have testified extensively that U LOCK had no employees and did not consider Shanni Snyder to be an employee. She also notes that there is no evidence that Shanni was a contractor of U LOCK and further observes that Shanni does not qualify as an employee under the FLSA because U LOCK was an immediately -- or an immediate family-owned business. And, even if she had such a claim under the FLSA, the statute of limitations is two years.

Biros' also asserts that the claimant Shanni worked for ten hours a night, every night, for four years, is on its face incredible, and given that the security setup at the site did not have wifi or other connectivity, it is unclear how

Shanni could have monitored the cameras as alleged in her claim.

1

2

3

5

7

10

11

15

17

19

16 Honor. Thank you.

Ms. Snyder filed a response arguing that Biros is $4\parallel$ seeking to collaterally attack her judgment and she asserts that judicial estoppel cannot apply because she later amended her schedules and only part of the claim belonged to her estate, and finally suggests that if an evidentiary hearing is necessary to address the validity of the judgment, the reference should be withdrawn to permit the District Court to do so.

So, again, those are my initial observations of what 12 | had been contended by each of the parties with respect to that pending claim objection. Is there anything further that Ms. Biros wishes to raise with respect to that claim objection? MR. BERNSTEIN: Nothing further at this point, Your

THE COURT: All right, thank you. All right, Mr. 18 Lacher, how about on your behalf for Ms. Snyder?

MR. LACHER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. Again, as noted, we're dealing here with a final judgment and I would also point out that Ms. Biros has commenced a RICO action in the District Court, which includes the same attacks on the judgment that they raise here before Your Honor. So, you have them asking the District Court to pass on the facts and they have Your Honor asking to pass on the facts, and based on Your

1 Honor's findings in regard to the last objection, I'd also $2 \parallel \text{point out, they rely largely on a case issued by Judge Deller,}$ 3 kind of stating that this Court can always get behind a 4 | judgment in a claims objection situation. I don't think that $5\parallel$ case says that at all. That was a case that dealt with confessed judgments that, on the face of the record, were not lawful, the process was not followed. In this instance, Ms. Snyder filed her complaint. Went to court. Attended a hearing in front of Judge Colville. Judge Colville took evidence. Judge -- including testimony from Ms. Snyder. He rendered a final judgment. That judgment is a year and a half old. Nobody has attacked it, and I do believe this Court can't get behind it, and I also believe that if it is going to be challenged, it should go back to the District Court, as Your 15 Honor mentioned.

7

11

16

17

18

20

23

24

THE COURT: Okay. Anything in response, Mr. Bernstein?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Nothing that we haven't already set 19 forth, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. All right. I'll address the points as follows. I do think that Shanni's judgment was entered by default. It's clearly indicated as such and, therefore, I reach the finding that it is not entitled to preclusive effect, and in support of that, I do 25 rely on the In re Chatkin case, 465 B.R. 54, at Page 65, which

7

8

11

15

16

17

18

22

23

24

is a decision of the Bankruptcy Court of the Western District 2 of Pennsylvania from 2012, which provided, quote, as a general rule under federal law, any issue raised in a case where a $4 \parallel$ default judgment was entered is not actually litigated for 5 purposes of collateral estoppel, and therefore does not bar litigation of the issue in the Second Federal Court, end quote.

There is no exception where the defendant never appeared and participated. I think Biros is correct that the statute of limitations for the FLSA claim is two years, with the possibility of three years for a wilful violation. under 29 U.S.C., Section 255(a), and to the extent that Shanni reopened her bankruptcy case and amended her schedules and entered into a settlement with the Trustee, I do find that judicial estoppel would appear to be moot and is no longer at play here.

But, even though Shanni is the sister of Kash and George, it is unclear whether adult siblings under the circumstances would be considered, quote, immediate family under the FLSA, and I think there are some factual issues that are raised here, but nevertheless, the fact that there is a judgment, does require at this point for the Court to schedule an evidentiary hearing on the merits of the claim itself. And, so I am prepared to do that and we'll issue a suitable pretrial My expectation though is that this should not be a long 25 or involved process. I am contemplating an evidentiary hearing

5

6

7

11

15

17

18

19

23

24

of no more than two hours and I think the primary witness would $2 \parallel$ be Ms. Snyder herself. If there is cause to be shown that there are needs for other witnesses, we can address that, but I'm not envisioning that as we sit here today.

To the extent the parties need a discovery period, I'm prepared to provide a brief 60-day discovery period for that. But, in short, I'm moving forward with quantifying the claims of this estate, and the only way to do so is to have an evidentiary hearing on the merits of that claim objection. the extent that Ms. Snyder wants to seek a withdraw of the reference, that's her prerogative. She can file an appropriate motion with the District Court. The District Court can act with it as it deems necessary, but my expectation would be that liquidating and determining the allowance of claims is something that is normally done within the Bankruptcy Court and unless there's some other basis to seek a withdraw of the reference, I would not be betting money that the District Court would grant that.

But, nevertheless, I'm prepared to be surprised on that, but in the meantime, I'm not going to wait for the District Court to rule on that. This is an estate that needs to be properly addressed, and so I will move forward with the evidentiary hearing under the schedule that I've just outlined.

I would also note though that, and this is for Mr. 25 Lacher's benefit because he is new to the party, so to speak,

7

11

13

17

18

20

22

23

24

is that, on its face and given the circumstances of which $2 \parallel \text{unfolded}$, and again mind you, I'm not making any final determinations, but the veracity and validity of the Shanni 4 Snyder claim is certainly somewhat dubious. I made no mistake 5 about that and some of the things I've written in my orders before, and so I want to make sure that we're all clear on what the expectations are going forward, and that is the Court has already put all of the parties in this room and on the Zoom call on notice that I'm not tolerating any more games or crossing any lines. Rule 11 is in play and, to the extent that there were sworn statements given in this proceeding, penalty 12 of perjury also applies here.

So, as we move forward with an evidentiary hearing, I want folks to be mindful of that so that we can be all clear on what the expectation is and that there is no funny business or games that are being played as we move forward with the goal of including the administration of this estate and determining what the claims are and allowing the Trustee to take what limited resources he has and make distributions to creditors. So with that, any questions or further clarifications that the parties need at this stage?

MR. BERNSTEIN: No, Your Honor.

MR. LACHER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, while we're at it, I'm going to just 25 set a date. If I use 60 days from today for discovery, I have

1 the window of July 14th in the afternoon, which is a Friday, for an evidentiary hearing. How does that work for the parties?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Fine with us, Your Honor.

MR. LACHER: Fine with me, Your Honor.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

17

THE COURT: All right. Then, I'll set that for July 14th at 1:30 p.m.

MR. OTTO: Unless you're home for Bastille Day.

THE COURT: All right. That brings us forward to the next pending item, which I will take as the consent motion to approve the compromise under Rule 9019 and this is somewhat related to the amended application for administrative expenses that was filed by Christine Biros, which has drawn an objection from George Snyder. The motion to compromise has drawn objections from both George Snyder and Shanni Snyder and a consent response from the Chapter 7 Trustee.

Okay. So, again, where I view the papers at this $18 \parallel$ stage is as follows. Christine Biros and the Trustee have entered into a settlement of her claims. The settlement would provide for an allowance of an administrative expense claim of \$18,000 for use and occupancy of the subject property during the pendency of the bankruptcy. That equates to \$2,000 a month for a period of nine months. It would also allow amended Claim Number 2 in the amount of \$27,701.59 as a priority claim under 25 Section 507(a)(8) for pre and post-petition real estate taxes

8

11

17

18

22

23

1 incurred on the real property. Biros will reduce this claim to $2 \parallel$ the extent the taxes are paid by the estate. It will also allow Claim Number 3 in the amount of \$162,000 as a general 4 unsecured claim for the pre-petition use and occupancy of the $5\parallel$ property. That is based on a rental figure of \$7,000 a month for 81 months, dating back to approximately July of 2015.

And, Claim Number 4, which is \$200,000 as an allowed general unsecured claim for environmental remediation costs. And, Ms. Biros asserts that this is the middle range of the remediation estimates she received. I have objections from Shanni Snyder indicating that Biros' claims are premature, because they are based on Biros' alleged ownership, which Shanni has challenged in an avoidance action that is pending before this Court, and even if Shanni is not successful, she alleges that the rent claims are excessive in relation to the 16 fair market value. She also contends that rent would constitute unjust enrichment, because after obtaining title to the property, she would effectively be recovering a second time for the same pre-petition period. And, Shanni also contends the environmental claim is unilateral estimate of damages and does not address the availability of insurance coverage for the garbage truck fire.

George has filed an objection indicating that he 24 thinks that \$1500 a month for administrative expense rent is the more appropriate number. He objects to Biros seeking rent

6

9

10

11

14

17

18

19

20

22

1 and real estate taxes and objects to the real estate taxes $2 \parallel$ being paid to her, as they are owed to the taxing authorities, and objects to the pre-petition rent on the basis that the 4 State Court did not grant retroactive relief.

I will hear from the parties in just a minute, but I do have some additional questions for the Trustee with respect to this, and so -- well, let me go around the room first. Anything further from Ms. Biros' team with respect to this motion?

MR. BERNSTEIN: The only thing I'd point out and I don't know where the Court is inclined to go, at this point, Mr. Snyder is not a creditor and on his own I don't think would 13 have standing to object or --

THE COURT: I think that's correct, but that's just an order I issued today, so I think for the purposes of today, I'll still allow him to be heard with the expectation of I've ruled that he is not a creditor any further at this point.

> Thank you. That's all, Your Honor. MR. BERNSTEIN:

THE COURT: All right. So, anything further, Mr. Snyder? I'm going to come back after I hear from the Trustee, but any preliminary comments?

MR. SNYDER: Just preliminarily, the State Court, you know, kind of looked at it as if we owed this -- the State Court looked at is as, you know, part of the basis of their judgment, was to say that we owed the taxes, so in lieu of

1 taxes, they gave them the property, so they get the property, 2 and now they're going to come back and try to get the money for the taxes. So, that was one of my -- I just don't think the -the settlement, I think it lacks good faith and it's not a good business decision for that reason and several others --

THE COURT: Okay. And --

MR. SNYDER: -- others.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

19

24

25

THE COURT: -- Mr. Lacher, anything else from you preliminarily?

MR. LACHER: Yes, Your Honor. I would just say that there is a claims process under the bankruptcy code. Parties in interest have an opportunity to object. There's no real deadline on that in the Chapter 7 case. Obviously, if Your Honor wants these objections filed, you can order it and we would most certainly obey, but to be bound to have our right to object taken away because the Trustee and Ms. Biros agree to the treatment of the claims vis-a-vis the Trustee, I think, would be improper.

So, I would say at the very least we should be given an opportunity to object. But, again, as set forth in my response, I think that's pretty wasteful and maybe needlessly costly and time consuming if the avoidance action is going to make all these claims subject to change, so I would just put that --

THE COURT: Okay, but why wasn't there an objection

raised prior to this? I mean, these claims have been out there for a while. It looks like Ms. Biros filed her claims back in August and, you know, I've now looking to conclude the estate. I've had the Trustee liquidate some of the proceeds or some of the assets into proceeds. You've got your adversary claim. I mean, this is the time to quantify claims, so I don't know why it's incumbent upon the Court to actually set a deadline for claims objections at this point. The creditors were free to file objections at any point.

MR. LACHER: Well, I agree, Your Honor, but -- and I do agree. But, I would also say that we're not passed a deadline to file objections. You know, and again, Ms. Biros just filed her claim to Ms. Snyder's and Mr. Snyder's objection. Those claims sat there for a long time, as well. In this case, you have an avoidance action intervening. It can really change the validity or mootness of those claims. That said, if Your Honor wants objections, we'll absolutely file them right away.

10

11

17

18

19

21

22

24

THE COURT: Well, I'm just saying. I mean, the motion to compromise was filed -- when was this filed?

MR. BERNSTEIN: March 1st, Your Honor.

THE COURT: March 1st. So, we're a month in.

There's been no claim objection. This was an effort to compromise the claim. I'm thinking if there was a time to object to the claim, it's now or never, and so I'm not too

8

11

17

18

1 receptive to parties that want to sit on their rights and then

2 claim somehow that there's a need for a further delay when the issue has been teed up. The Trustee has had a discussion with 4 Biros about compromising the claims. The Trustee obviously 5 must have had some reason to object in his own right to some of the claims and that's why the parties have come forward with a compromise to resolve their dispute. So, this is the time to do it. All right, well, let me turn to the Trustee. Relatedly, Mr. Slone, is it correct for me to understand that 10 | you've investigated these claims and you've looked into them? MR. SLONE: I have, Your Honor. Before we get too 12 far, the claim for the real estate taxes had to be paid directly to the Tax Claim Bureau of Westmoreland County. think that was part of the agreement. It doesn't have to go to Mrs. Biros. It can be paid there. So, I'm holding a little over \$70,000 in my account. If the administrative claim is between 15 and \$18,000 and the tax claim is \$27,000, that's over \$40,000 right there. I have a lot of time in this case. My bookkeeper pointed out I have 155 hours already in the case. Even if half of that is legal time we're eating up most of the \$70,000 with administrative costs in the tax claims, Your Honor. We're fighting over -- we'd be fighting over just a little bit of money on unsecureds at this point. I don't think we're going to get too many -- too much money left for the 25 unsecured creditors, Your Honor.

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

17

19

21

THE COURT: Well, that's kind of my thought, as well, 2 but you've investigated the claims, you've looked at the assertions that Ms. Biros has made in terms of what she's 4 alleging in each one of these components that you're seeking to compromise?

MR. SLONE: I am, Your Honor. Rather than me file objections in all four claims, I thought this was the best way to handle this.

THE COURT: All right, and there's a reference to 10 \parallel this appraisal report or the estimate of the fair rental value and the valuation of the property. Have you seen those 12 reports?

MR. SLONE: I got the -- not the entire reports. got the summary from Mr. Lindsay and Mr. Bernstein when we were trying to put this thing together, Your Honor. I disregarded most of it. I didn't feel that it was worth anywhere near \$7,000 a month for rent. I thought 2,000 was more of a figure 18 that I would be more comfortable with, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And, what -- have you run down the issue on the garbage fire insurance?

MR. SLONE: I have not, Your Honor. Although, the U 22∥LOCK would be, under the law, would be responsible even if it wasn't there -- or could be responsible. And, again, it would only be if an unsecured creditor for the amount of money we are dealing with would be de minimis.

THE COURT: All right, let me go around $2 \parallel$ the room one more time. Then, based on where we are at this point, anything further from Christine Biros?

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm just going to point out with $5\parallel$ respect to what the Trustee said, there were more than one environmental problem on the property. The truck fire was only the most recent one. And, the compromise amount obviously is significantly less than the fair rental value under this broker's report, this real estate appraisal report that we received. We'd certainly make that available if necessary. There's no attempt to hide it. There was no --

MR. SLONE: Your Honor, may I ask Mr. Bernstein to speak into the microphone?

> THE COURT: Okay.

1

4

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

23

24

25

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Is --

MR. BERNSTEIN: I was just saying that there was more 18 than one environmental problem. It wasn't just the truck. And, with respect to the \$7,000 opinion by the appraiser, the comprise is -- the compromise agreement with the Trustee is for significantly less than that. And, I believe we may have provided the summary pages to Mr. Slone. It is a bonafide report. There is no attempt to hide it and we'll produce it as requested.

THE COURT: Okay, and you will produce that? All

right. All right, anything further, Mr. Snyder?

1

2

9

10

17

18

21

23

24

25

MR. SNYDER: Yeah. In response to that, they said there was no attempt to hide it. In fact, the person who did 4 the environmental report did in fact hide. He parked his car 5 down the street, walked over, and did what he did. 6 no other environmental issues. The DEP had came out several times from Harrisburg and said there was no issue and nothing the buyers were required to remediate, so that's a fabricated number, in my opinion.

Also, there weren't other environmental issues that 11 were new to the property. When the property was acquired, 12 \parallel there were some tires there. Some junk vehicles and things like that. In January, myself and a couple people cleaned up everything that really wasn't our responsibility to clean up, and I believe the purchaser, or my sister purchasing the assets, cleaned the property even further, so everything was cleaned up, which really they weren't entitled to that cleanup. So, I don't see where there would be one dollar required to clean up anything let alone a couple hundred thousand, so I don't think that's a good compromise.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, do you have anything to back that up in terms of additional evidence or an environmental expert that would counter the American Geosciences report?

MR. SNYDER: As far as the garbage truck fire?

THE COURT: Well, just the environmental claim generally?

1

2

3

5

7

11

13

14

16

17

2.4

25

MR. SNYDER: Well, I don't have -- I don't have anything to refute that, other than the fact that they don't have a report from the DEP saying it's required to clean up, because they did investigate it and came from Harrisburg several times and I haven't seen anything in any of the filings that said there was environmental damage because of this truck and anything had to be cleaned up. In fact, she told me in person that nothing needed to be cleaned up.

THE COURT: Well, is there a reason that the DEP has 12 to be a prerequisite to having an allowed environmental claim?

MR. SNYDER: Pardon me?

THE COURT: Is there somewhere that you can point to that a determination of the DEP is a prerequisite to having an environmental claim?

MR. SNYDER: Well, just that they are saying there's multiple environmental issues, and I'm just saying that it's 18 not really substantiated. And, then in the report, I don't know if it was -- I can't remember when this was done. was -- they had a report from an environmental company that said cars need to be removed, tires need to be removed. was a lot of issues and they've all been addressed and resolved that I'm aware of.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Lacher, anything

1 further from you?

2

11

12

13

17

18

22

23

24

MR. LACHER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. Again, I 3 would point out, there was not an attempt to sit on our rights 4 here. I did raise some substantive objections in my response, $5 \parallel I$ pointed out to the Court but I thought it might be wasteful in light of the avoidance action to do these things now. will point out that neither U LOCK, nor Biros, nor anyone else, has gone after the garbage truck owner that caused the problem, and I think there's grounds to object if the Court thinks it's necessary to object at this point, and I would ask that they be allowed to do so.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. So, I do have one additional question for Ms. Biros and that is, so the contention is that the pre-petition rent is a double recovery. Why is that not accurate, because I mean it's unclear to me that the State Court order was meant to be entirely retroactive and it would seem to me that if the State Court was issuing an order saying, "well, because you lent the money, it would be 19 unjust enrichment for U LOCK to have title with no ability to pay back that money, a constructive trust was imposed." But, why does that entitle Ms. Biros to pre-petition rent on top of that?

So, obviously, Your Honor, the MR. BERNSTEIN: initial position is that the purpose of this compromise is to avoid litigating these issues which may be in dispute.

1 Biros was the beneficial owner of this property since 2015 and 2 did not have the use of the property, we believe that she has a claim against the party who held the property for the fair 4 rental value of that property. The so-called unjust 5 enrichment, and I know we're using unjust enrichment twice in this situation, but that's advisedly.

6

7

8

11

13

14

17

18

24

So, her property, she had a right to this property. She had the equity interest in this property that was worth something, and it was kept from her. She couldn't use it. She's entitled to some -- compensation for that. And, even though she has the property today, or as of the end of January, she had that whole pre-petition period where she did not have the property.

THE COURT: Okay. So, let me stop you there. 15 in the State Court order, either Trial Court or Superior Court does it reach back to 2015 or does it give her title retroactively? I mean, it just seemed that it imposed a constructive trust, declared the 2015 deeds void ab initio, but 19 that doesn't necessarily equate to giving title to Ms. Biros as of 2015. At least that's my initial review. So, if you want to direct me somewhere else, I'm happy to do that, because, again, she was deemed by the State Court to be a lender here and the constructive trust was imposed as an equitable remedy, so she normally would not be the titleholder, and so this was 25 | extraordinary relief that was given, and so, as such, I need to

1 have an understanding of how she can reach back to 2015 for that rent.

2

3

6

7

8

9

17

24

25

MR. BERNSTEIN: I don't know that we have all of 4 those documents here, Your Honor. And, Mr. Otto, who is more $5 \parallel$ conversant with this, is going to see if he can point to that.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I know Mr. Snyder included the copies of the State Court and Superior Court orders to his responses, so that's one area where the copy is.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Here -- look through there. While 10∥Mr. Otto is looking, Your Honor, just briefly in response to what Mr. Lacher said. Purpose of the compromise is to avoid 12 the fight. The Court certainly has the power to allow the claims, and allowing the claims ends the ability of other parties to object. Ms. Snyder, as the Court said, has been here since the beginning. Has -- these claims have been here 16 since almost the beginning of this case. We were here three or four months ago when the Court admonished both Ms. Snyder and 18 \parallel Ms. Biros to bring their actions and let's get this going. 19 you wanted us to bring the objections to the claims, to their claims. You wanted her to bring the avoidance action. All of that is now in play. It simply doesn't make sense to us to allow some further period for them to object, to have us litigate these claims that we're trying to compromise. Now, that will change the whole deal with the Trustee.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let me tell you where

7

10

11

12

17

18

20

21

22

I'm at, at this point, while you search for that. This is a 2 settlement and compromise, so I'm not looking for perfection and I'm not looking for, you know, crossing every T and dotting $4 \parallel \text{ every I.}$ I do find that what's been proposed is the allowed 5 administrative expense for use and occupancy post petition wise at \$18,000, is reasonable under the circumstances. far off from what the Court had originally estimated during the sale process, and I acknowledged that that's a significant change from the position that Ms. Biros was at several months earlier.

As to the taxes, I don't know that there's necessarily a dispute as to that from what I heard from Mr. Snyder. I mean, there's an acknowledgment that real estate taxes are due and owing. If it's due and owing from U LOCK, and I don't think particularly that there's an issue with that, then that would be paid from the U LOCK estate. If it's not paid from the U LOCK estate, Ms. Biros, as the current title holder, is alleging that she's entitled to reimbursement from the estate for that. So, I do find that that aspect of the compromise is not a really compromise. It's just commonsense at this point.

As to Claim Number 4 and the environmental claim. It's \$200,000. I acknowledged that I have a report from American Geosciences in 2020 that was attached suggesting that 25 \parallel the remediation was about \$414,000. Ms. Biros has also alleged

6

11

12

14

17

18

20

23

1 that there's estimates between 125 to \$314,000 for the cleanup $2 \parallel \text{work.}$ And, this is a significant compromise down to \$200,000, so Biros asserts that that's the middle range of the 4 remediation estimates.

As I noted during the exchange with the parties, I don't have anything from anybody else challenging those numbers from any degree of certainty or expertise. It's just conjecture. And, at this point, I just need more than just bare lay opinion. I need some sort of data points to look at and I've got the Trustee relaying to me that he has investigated these things. He has taken the time to drill down and represents the \$200,000 allowance for that claim is 13 reasonable.

Where I do have the problem and where I think the Snyders have made a compelling argument to me, is with respect to this general unsecured claim for their pre-petition use and occupancy of the premises. \$7,000 a month for 81 months. my review, I'm not convinced that the State Court has 19 retroactively granted her relief for that period and it would seem to be a double recovery, and so I'm not inclined to allow or accept that portion of the settlement. If that blows things up, then be that as it may, but I'm inclined to otherwise rule in that direction. I do find that the Martin factors otherwise are satisfied. I think there's a probability of success on the 25 \parallel merits, weighs to the fact that there is a likelihood that Ms.

1 Biros can prevail on her claims as showing entitlement to $2 \parallel post-petition$ rent and reimbursement of taxes for the reasons I've stated, as well as proof that environmental remediation $4 \parallel \text{cost}$ exist, and those costs existed before the garbage truck $5 \parallel$ fire and are separate and distinct from that whole fiasco.

6

7

8

11

17

18

21

The difficulty of collection, you know, is one of the estate having limited assets and, furthermore, there is a complexity of the matter that would require unnecessary time and expense and delay to go through and litigate these matters. One thing that's been apparent to me throughout this case and I've remarked on it on several occasions, is the parties have no problems litigating minute or small dollar amount issues to the hilt in a way that is totally out of proportion of what the value of the claim is, so that's to me probably the most compelling thing here is that this would preserve what little is left in the estate for the distribution of creditors. so from that standpoint, it's in the paramount interest of creditors to allow the estate to proceed to quantify these claims and get closer to a distribution that the Chapter 7 Trustee can make to creditors.

Having said all that, I am mindful of one thing that 22∥Mr. Lacher has said, which is he's got his pending avoidance action out there and I think that could change the perspective here. So, as a result, I'm prepared, based on what I've said on the record, I'll give Ms. Biros' team one last chance to

1 respond on this pre-petition rent thing, but that the allowance $2 \parallel$ is on an interim basis, but the payment of any claim would be held in abeyance pending the conclusion of the avoidance 4 action. And, from that standpoint, that would allow me to 5 ensure that there is no money going out the door prematurely 6 until we have a full handle on the what the estate is and what the respective rights of the parties are.

7

8

11

17

18

Having said that, and I understand that this is not teed up for today, but if nothing, I always try to be candid with you all so you know exactly where I sit on these things. I've had a chance to look at the avoidance action and, right now, I have to tell you, I'm not real impressed with it. You know, I question whether it could be dismissed as implausible under Twombly and, specifically, the complaint seems to be more mechanical and simply assumes that the constructive trust is an avoidable transfer without giving any more depth or background to that. So, again, that's not a final determination. just an initial off-the-cuff reaction of what I've seen on the pleadings, but it does color, in an extent, to me, the scheduling of where we are and the need to move forward and what the expectations are for what I think the time frames need to be to bring this matter to a close. If I thought there was more there, then I think we would be inclined to have a more robust time frame for this to occur. It's not to say we're not going to do that here. It's just that I'm starting to question

4

5

9

10

11

17

22

23

24

whether or not this is something that can be resolved on a Rule 12 stage at this point, but we'll see what the coming weeks are at this point.

Again, just food for thought for the parties so that there are no surprises, and the parties can come into the courtroom on the appropriate date adequately prepared to address what I see as some concerns at this stage. So with that, let me come back, anything further on the pre-petition rent?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor, just a couple of things addressing, maybe in reverse order, what the Court said. If the Court -- we understand the concern about the avoidance action might have some affect on payment of these claims and we don't expect -- we don't expect payment now other than perhaps the tax claim should be paid and we would be happy to work with the Trustee. The Trustee may want to file a claim on behalf of the Tax Claim Bureau. I believe the Trustee is entitled to do 18 that. And, if that's allowed, because Ms. Biros isn't looking for a duplicate claim, so we can -- we'd like to put that one to bed. We'd like to put the fight over Ms. Biros' claims to bed now, even if payment is not made until ultimately later in the case or at the end of the case.

With respect to the 2015 issue, I think the -- Mr. Otto, who litigated that, can speak more to it, but in looking at the August 2019 order, perhaps the particular section, I'm

1 sorry paragraph, is that, one, it says "plaintiff, Christine $2 \parallel \text{Biros}$, is the equitable owner of the subject property." It does not indicate in that paragraph, that 2015, that it's 4 retroactive to them. Even -- and I think Mr. Otto can explain 5 why that is and perhaps satisfy the Court that it is 6 retroactive. Even if it isn't, it would be effective as of that date, which is August of 2019, and if we count August of 2019 to the petition date, I think I count 45 months. months at our asserted fair rental value of \$7,000 a month is 10 \parallel more than the 162,000 that we've compromised. 45 months, even at the \$2,000 that we've been using in the admin claim is \$90,000, and I would need a few seconds to speak with Ms. Biros about whether that would be a number that would satisfy her if that would eliminate that retroactivity issue from the Court's concerns. If I may have just a --

11

15

16

17

18

23

24

THE COURT: Well, yes, I mean, my initial reaction to that though is that even though that was the decision in 2019, that the deeds were still not delivered until later and, you know, it's -- I don't want to get back into asking the State Court to have to clarify that order because it's just not time intensive. And the other aspect of this, which I think is another point that's been raised by several parties is, at the end of the day, is this going to really matter when the Trustee is holding no more than \$70,000 plus whatever could be salvaged 25 from the avoidance claim? I've already told you that I've got

some concerns about the avoidance claims, so if I go with the supposition that there's only \$70,000, arguing over an additional hundred and --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Sixty-two.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

17

18

19

20

THE COURT: -- sixty-two thousand when I've already said I'm going to allow the 200,000 plus the 27,000 for taxes and the 18,000 for the administrative claim, I just think it's a fool's errand.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, you're right, and if the Shanni Snyder claim was disallowed also and Ms. Biros knew that her \$200,000 general unsecured claim was the only one, then it would be -- that would be an easy resolution. We're still in a little bit of shifting sands, but we know there's very little, and I'd love to figure out a way so that this compromise could resolve all of those things. That's what we were trying to do with the Trustee. Perhaps Mr. Otto can just give you a couple of minutes on the State Court, that background to see if --

THE COURT: All right. I'll allow it very briefly.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you.

MR. OTTO: Your Honor, the Trial Court actually issued three post-trial orders. The first was the judgment and that was on the August 2019 date. The second was an order in response to post-trial motions. The third order was issued in mid-2022 in response to appeals by U LOCK, Shanni Snyder, and Mark Mycka, when he issued a 1925 order. The appeals from U

1 LOCK, Mark Mycka, and Shanni Snyder, were all filed post $2 \parallel$ petition, and he was -- the judge was required by Superior Court to issue a 1925 opinion, which he did. And, in the 4 course of those three orders -- and I apologize, we don't have $5\parallel$ those three orders in front of us, we only have the Trial Court 6 or the trial decision. In at least one of those, the judge specifically states that she had equitable title dating back to 2015.

I would also point out something that Mr. Bernstein 10∥probably wasn't thinking about. The way this trial went, there 11 \parallel were deeds that were issued by the estates in May of 2019. 12 After the final decision by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, then we recorded the deeds that we received from the Trial Court. Those deeds were dated in May of 2019, which in essence predate the Trial Court's trial judgment. So, if the question is how far back do we go, theoretically, we could go back to legal title in May of 2019.

> THE COURT: Okay.

7

8

9

17

18

19

24

25

MR. OTTO: But, I -- if Your Honor wants or asks for, I would be happy to provide the portions of the Trial Court's orders that state that she had equitable title dating back to 2015. I do agree with Mr. Bernstein that you get to the point where it doesn't make a big difference because there's not enough money to cover everything anyway.

THE COURT:

MR. BERNSTEIN: Let me see if I can help here, Judge. 2 THE COURT: Well, I mean, yes, all right, if you have 3 a suggestion. 4 MR. BERNSTEIN: I do have a suggestion. Using August of 2019 when the order occurred, or using -- when was the deed 5 6 dated." 7 MR. OTTO: May. 8 MR. BERNSTEIN: -- May when the deeds were dated, we would offer the Trustee a unilateral amendment to our 10 \parallel settlement to reduce Claim 3 to \$90,000. We think that's fair. The cost of litigating this, it's not worth it to anybody. 11 really, in this settlement, tried to protect the Trustee so that at this point the reasonable expectation is the Trustee is going to get paid for what he did and what his counsel did and

If the Court were to allow the administrative claim, allow the 17

16 that is not clear. You know, so I'll bid against myself twice.

15 we're not in his pocket. The more we litigate this, the more

tax payment either to us or to the Tax Claim Bureau, allow 18

Claim 4 of the general unsecured claim, and allow the Claim 3

in any amount from 0 to \$162,000, we would be satisfied.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Say that last part again?

MR. BERNSTEIN: The last part is, we'll give up on

Claim 3 --23

21

22

24

25

1

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERNSTEIN: -- if we can't convince the Court

3

5

7

8

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

2.4

25

that there is some value to that. It's just not worth it to 2 stand here and argue over it.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Well, that's $4\parallel$ where I was ending up on this, is that I am prepared to enter an interim order approving the settlement on the grounds that I said, which is to allow the administrative expense, the tax claim, and the environmental claim, to preclude the pre-petition rent claim on the basis that I've said, and payment would be deferred pending the resolution of the avoidance action and we'll take it back up again when that's concluded, at which time I would enter a final order authorizing the settlement at that point, because I just don't see a utility in having a full blown evidentiary hearing on this. That's the whole point of a settlement is to avoid unnecessary litigation when the costs exceed the benefits.

So having said all of that, I'm going to issue an order to that effect and then we'll take up the rest of it once the --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, if I may just ask for clarification to --

THE COURT: -- avoidance action is resolved, with the exception of the tax claim though. I mean, if the Trustee --

MR. BERNSTEIN: If I heard correctly, the allowance will not be final until the avoidance action is resolved?

THE COURT: What I will do is, I will withhold the

payments and the distributions until the avoidance action is resolved.

MR. BERNSTEIN: That's fine. I just don't want to $4 \parallel$ have to come back and fight over the claims again. Thank you.

THE COURT: But --

1

2

3

5

6

7

11

13

17

19

22

24

25

MR. LACHER: Well, Your Honor -- I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Well, let me make this clear though. saying the distributions would be withheld, with the exception that if the Trustee wishes to proceed with paying the tax claim 10∥ to the Tax Claim Bureau he is free to do that because that's something that would be independent of the settlement here. 12 Mr. Lacher?

MR. LACHER: Yes, Your Honor. The one I'm focused on 14 is the environmental claim and this kind of mirrors Mr. 15 Bernstein's question for clarification. If we were successful in the avoidance action, am I to understand Ms. Biros would have an allowed claim from the environmental clean up even 18 though she's not the owner of the property?

THE COURT: Well, she would not receive a 20 distribution on that claim if she is not the owner of that 21 property. That's how I would rectify that.

MR. LACHER: I appreciate that, Your Honor, and that's why, again, I wanted to know the effect of the allowance, let's say.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. LACHER: Thank you, Your Honor.

1

2

3

4

7

11

14

17

19

THE COURT: Okay. All right, any other clarifications or questions that we have with respect to that?

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm sorry, Your Honor, I have to do $5\parallel$ this, because the landscape just changed again. If the avoidance action is successful, that will put more money in the estate. If the unsecured claim of Ms. Biros is disallowed because the avoidance action is successful, then she will have given up her claim to the pre-petition rent argument as part of the settlement and be left with nothing out of the unsecured portion. We're just trying to fix the rights now and if the avoidance action is successful, she's likely -- she will have lost a significant value.

THE COURT: Well, no, I don't know. I mean, if she loses the avoidance action, that would deem that she is not the owner of the property. She would not be subject to the environmental obligations at that point because she has no duty 18 to do that as not being the owner, so --

MR. BERNSTEIN: We can't say that for sure. 20 - if she's a potentially responsible person, party, now, we don't know whether the environmental claim will follow her because she was the owner of that property during the time that it occurred. She may have some liability and there's no -there's nobody indemnifying her. I know it creates a complication, but that's part of why we did this, this way,

1 with the Trustee, because otherwise she can come out -- I know 2 that we don't expect her to lose the avoidance action, but lightening strikes. If she lost the avoidance action, 4 therefore, loses her environmental claim, doesn't get any 5 distribution as an unsecured creditor, but is a target of 6 somebody, perhaps the new owner of the property, Ms. Snyder, who decides to go after people who were in control of the property when the environmental situation happened. It just opens up a whole can of worms.

THE COURT: All right. Well, if that's the case, then what I'm doing is, I'm just deferring any determination on 12 the settlement motion until after the avoidance action is 13 concluded because --

MR. BERNSTEIN: I guess you have to do that, Judge. I can't -- we're -- I'm sorry -- yeah, other than perhaps the taxes, but the rest of it --

THE COURT: Well, the taxes, but I mean, again, you 18 raise a point about her being in a chain of title as being a 19 responsible party for the environmental, but I'm still not hearing how she would have any claim to pre-petition rent if she was not the owner having lost the avoidance action. But, be that as it may, you know, this is starting to dilute the efficacy of having a compromise, so --

> MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah.

7

10

11

14

16

17

23

24

25

THE COURT: -- at this stage, I'm inclined to just

1 defer it until after the avoidance action and then I'll take it 2 up at that point and see what the landscape is at that stage. But I think that, as I indicated, my views on the 4 administrative expense claim are such that I think that would 5 be a satisfactory resolution of the administrative expense motion, but if we're not going to approve that today then I'm going to just --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, one moment please. Sorry.

10 (Pause)

7

8

9

11

17

18

22

24

MR. BERNSTEIN: What we're discussing, Your Honor, is 12 whether it's worth upsetting this settlement and then allowing the other parties to file objections to the claims or taking the beating that we're taking today and having you allow the claims, which will prevent another set of objections to the claims in the litigation that would follow there. we'll take what the Court offered before I raised the environmental responsibility issue. I just think that that is -- that we're better off taking that and eliminating the ongoing fight objection from the Snyders as to these claims and beating them to death.

THE COURT: Well, again, I think if the avoidance action is successful, it changes the landscape of rights. changes Ms. Biros from being an owner, back to being a lender, and what that entails. You know, you've got potentially

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

another \$300,000 worth of claims that she would have at that $2 \parallel \text{point so, but, again, I had viewed this as a way of trying to}$ $3 \parallel$ narrow the issues, but if it's going to create more, then I'm just going to defer it and then we'll see what happens with the avoidance action and make that determination at that time.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Is the Court willing to determine that the process to date and the opportunity to object to this settlement was a sufficient time for the other parties in the case to --

THE COURT: I definitely think that the settlement was appropriately noticed and there was adequate time to be heard with respect to the merits of the settlement.

MR. BERNSTEIN: However Your Honor wants to handle it at this point. I will just add that the avoidance action being successful does not automatically undo Ms. Biros' rights that occurred during the time that she was an owner or a constructive owner, just as if Ms. Biros had received a monetary transfer, if it -- if that monetary transfer or that 19∥ preference were avoided, but she had used that money to create some investment that she made a million dollars on, the estate's claim for the avoidance would not be the profits on the avoidance, it would just be the value at the time that it was transferred. So, she's still going to have her claims as a constructive owner and as a real owner, regardless of whether 25 \parallel the transfer was avoided. She was an owner during the time she

1 was an owner. So, I just don't think it's automatic that if $2 \parallel$ they win the avoidance action that her claims disappear. With that, I'll sit down and Your Honor decide --

THE COURT: Well, I didn't say they'd disappear. just -- I think they get recharacterized into different types of claims, but --

> MR. BERNSTEIN: Perhaps.

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

17

18

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: You know, all right. And, since we've had a long exchange there, anything further, Mr. Lacher, that you wanted to add at this point?

MR. LACHER: No thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: George?

MR. SNYDER: Yes. If I can clarify two things. the environmental claim, they had mentioned something about the things that had happened while Christine was the owner. For clarification, the only thing environmental would have been that fire truck -- or garbage truck that caught on fire. All the other stuff, the property was purchased in a condition with the tires, and cars, and different things. None of that was U LOCK bringing any environmental issues to the table. So, I wanted to clarify that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SNYDER: And, the thing with the rent, I had just 24 wanted to mention. I spoke with Mr. Slone and officially they 25∥ were given -- the Biros were given sole control, possession of

1 the property in October, because I was -- because they put a $2 \parallel$ cable up. Locked me out, the tenants out. In fact, there were tenants that they knew. They met them before, exchanged $4 \parallel$ numbers and information and called the police on them, and I $5\parallel$ think Mr. Otto actually went to the police station the next day to try to get them arrested. So, but prior to that, and I believe early on, you know, it was like the Biros took over full trustee powers from Mr. Slone and he appeared to be in the backseat. And, when I spoke to Mr. Slone about it, he had said that he was threatened by them, so I'm not sure --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, I'll object to that, 12 hearsay.

11

13

14

17

18

20

MR. SNYDER: Here, he could maybe speak to that.

THE COURT: All right. Well, it's not relevant to 15 the issue that I'm hearing, other then that you're contending that Ms. Biros had full control of the property, which I understand you've made before, and I have discussed that in my opinion before that it's not as if she was deprived of all access to the property during the time period. But, what this comes down to is, what is a reasonable value of what the estate's interest was for having possession of the property, and bottom line is, irrespective of whether Ms. Biros had control of 80 percent of the property or none of the property, the fact of the matter is, the estate had assets on the property at that time. The use of the property was beneficial

1 to the estate and, as such, Ms. Biros, as the title holder, is $2 \parallel$ entitled to some sort of compensation for the reasonable value, 3 and you know we've discussed that ad nauseam at the prior $4 \parallel$ hearings. But, you know, again, I come back to where we are $5 \parallel \text{now}$, \$2,000 a month. You, yourself, said 1500 was reasonable. 6 This is just slightly above that, so I'm not really quibbling with that amount at this stage.

MR. SNYDER: Okay, and that -- that's the part I was getting at. That's what I was discussing with Mr. Slone, \mid because I said about the 1500, which could have been a reasonable amount, but I was telling him, that wasn't even necessarily fair because I didn't have access to doing anything. You couldn't do anything. And, Mr. Slone seemed to, you know, he said I had a good point. But, yeah, I'm not arguing about --

> THE COURT: Okay.

7

8

11

15

16

17

19

20

21

MR. SNYDER: -- you know, the particulars there, 18 other than they weren't really entitled to anywhere near this.

> THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I'm going to take this 22 \parallel under advisement and consider whether what kind of order I do, if I do an order with respect to the settlement motion, but we've had an extensive discussion on this so you know where the Court has preliminary comments has been and what my inclination

2

3

7

11

13

14

15

17

18

21

24

25

47

was initially. I'll ponder some more what was discussed and see if that changes my thought process at all.

Relatedly, is the Christine Biros' amended motion for 4 allowance of payment of the administrative expense. I did have 5 the objections from George Snyder and I think we've covered that, so to the extent that I approve the settlement, that will render the administrative claim motion moot. To the extent that I deny or defer approval of the settlement, that will keep that objection live and I'll issue a scheduling order on that further, to the extent that that remains an active issue.

MR. BERNSTEIN: On that scheduling, Your Honor, we're 12 happy to have it ride along if the Court decides to defer the settlement. We're happy to have that admin motion ride along without it.

THE COURT: That's what I would intend to do, so 16 thank you.

> MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. So, then the next item is the 19 order to show cause that was issued on January 17, 2023. This relates to the administrative expenses. At the last hearing, I explained in detail why I found the filing of Christine Biros' motion for allowance of the administrative expense claim, pursuant to 11 U.S.C., Section 503(b)(1), was in violation of Rule 9011(b)(1) through (3) and why I found the response to be unpersuasive.

11

17

18

19

21

22

24

Most notably, the response offered no defense to the $2 \parallel$ assertion of the \$144,000 administrative expense, other than suggesting that Ms. Biros could have proven its reasonableness 4 had she been afforded an opportunity to submit a detailed The Court continued the order to show cause to allow 5 record. 6 Ms. Biros and Attorney Bernstein to -- time to consider the Court's comments and potentially seek reconsideration of the Court's memorandum. I note that no motion for reconsideration was filed, nor was there any further response. And, as noted, 10 Ms. Biros did file her amended motion for administrative expense seeking \$63,000, which was less than half of the original request, and then she then proposed to settle the claim for \$18,000, which is roughly 12.5 percent of the original request. So, as indicated in the Court's order dated January 30, 2023, at Docket Number 314, this was their last change to appear in opposition to the order to show case. So, anything further that the parties wish to raise or address at this point on that account?

MR. BERNSTEIN: The Court can resolve this obviously however it wants to.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I think we've shown why what was requested in the original admin motion was not completely unreasonable, or impossible, or so out of line. We've attempted to provide the estate with a way to resolve the admin

7

11

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

claim at a reasonable number. We have heard and taken to heart 2 the Court's comments about the way it proceeded. Although, and the fact that we did not file a motion for reconsideration or a 4 further response, frankly, we thought the filing -- we thought 5 our choices included filing an amended motion and that it wasn't necessary to file a new response or a motion for reconsideration and that it was open. And, we have -- we've previously apologized to the Court for taking an approach which the Court found unreasonable, and we did what we thought was an appropriate thing to do for our client under the circumstances.

As I said at the last hearing on this, Ms. Biros, on 12 \parallel this matter, followed our recommendations and did not have an independent decision to file the motion the way it was filed. We told her what we thought the appropriate thing to do is. So, to the extent there is a sanction to be applied, it should be us and not her. And, frankly, we think that we've suffered as a result of being in a position to receive that kind of order from the Court and I think that's all I have to say, Your 19 Honor.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you.

THE COURT: So, I mean, what I want to address though is there's no effort at this point to establish any further record, or offer anything else to suggest the reasonableness of the \$144,000?

4

11

15

16

17

18

22

23

24

25

MR. BERNSTEIN: Other than the assertions in our $2 \parallel$ amended motion that explain the various values and methods of computation, I have nothing -- nothing further to add today.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. All right, well, I'm 5 not finding anything that dissuades me from the original finding that there was a Rule 9011 issue with respect to the original motion and that the \$144,000 was unreasonable. Certainly, appreciate the efforts to try to resolve this through the amended motion. I thought that was certainly well crafted and well thought out and it doesn't go unnoticed from the Court, the time and effort that went into that. But, it still leaves me with the factor that the original claim of \$144,000 was settled for 12.5 percent of that, which seems to indicate again to me that the original amount was patently unreasonably.

In terms of where we go from here, I am considerate of the fact that Mr. Bernstein has indicated that Ms. Biros followed the advice of counsel and, as a result, with taking that advice, she is not blame worthy at this point with respect to sanctions. And, with respect to counsel, I do find that this is a first offense and that the prior memorandum opinion is a sufficient admonishment with respect to where we are with respect to this matter, so I will conclude it there with that.

> MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Going forward, we have the order to show

1 cause that was issued with respect to the stay violations. Ι $2 \parallel$ had just continued this as a placeholder in the event that there was anything else that had any bearing on those motions. They were submitted, but to the extent that there was 5 additional discussion that had an impact on the Court's findings or conclusions, I wanted to have the option open.

6

7

8

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

24

I'm not hearing anything today that would suggest that I need to add new considerations to the mix, but before I do close the door on that, I open it up one last time to the parties if there's anything else they wish to address on any other matters here?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Nothing further from Ms. Biros, Your 13 Honor.

> THE COURT: All right, thank you. Mr. Snyder?

MR. SNYDER: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Lacher?

MR. LACHER: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you.

All right, thank you. All right. Well, THE COURT: 19 then that concludes the matters that are presently set before the Court at this time. I will enter an order just to recap sustaining the objection to the claim of George Snyder. issue a scheduling order on the claim of Shanni Snyder. I will consider what I do with respect to the 9019 motion, and if it's granted, the application for administrative expenses at 344

WWW.JJCOURT.COM

will be denied as moot. If it's continued, then that motion at

344 will be continued and heard at the same time, and I have 2 addressed the show cause orders in the latter two with respect to the stay motions are under advisement with the other show cause having been resolved on the record for the reasons stated here today. And, with that, we will call it a day.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you, Your --

THE COURT: The Court will now stand adjourned and we will close the record. Thank you, everyone.

> MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Thank you, Your Honor.

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Thanks, Your Honor.

CERTIFICATION

I, WENDY ANTOSIEWICZ, court approved transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter and to the best of my ability.

19

17

18

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

/s/ Wendy Antosiewicz

21 WENDY ANTOSIEIWICZ

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. DATE: April 24, 2023

23

24

25